



STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

BT  
235  
25

THE SERVANT  
OF GOD

*Haīs θεο?*

W. ZIMMERLI  
J. JEREMIAS



ALEC R. ALLENSON, INC.  
635 EAST OGDEN AVENUE  
NAPERVILLE, ILL.

*This English translation of the article Ποῖς Θεοῦ from Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT was drafted by Harold Knight and afterwards completed by the editorial staff of the publisher, with help both from Professor Jeremias and his assistants in Göttingen.*

First published in the  
*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*  
ed. G. Kittel  
(Stuttgart 1952)

First published in English 1957

57-21804

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

*Printed in Great Britain  
by W. & J. Mackay & Co. Ltd., Chatham*

## CONTENTS

*Zimmerli*

<b>I THE OLD TESTAMENT</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1 THE PROFANE USE OF THE TITLE עָבֵד יְהוָה</b>	<b>9</b>
i עָבֵד =the slave	9
ii The עָבֵד in the service of the king	10
iii עָבֵד as a description of political submission	12
iv עָבֵד as a humble self-description	12
v The sanctuary servants	12
<b>2 עָבֵד IN RELIGIOUS USAGE</b>	<b>13</b>
i עָבֵד as the humble self-description of the pious in the presence of his God	13
ii 'Servants of Yahweh' in the plural as denoting the pious	16
iii עָבֵד יְהוָה in the singular as a description of Israel	17
iv עָבֵד יְהוָה as a title for specially distinguished figures	18
v The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah	23

*Zimmerli*

<b>II TRANSLATIONS IN THE LXX</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>1 THE עָבֵד TRANSLATIONS IN THE LXX</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>2 THE TRANSLATION OF SERVANT OF GOD PASSAGES IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH</b>	<b>40</b>

*Jeremias*

<b>III Παῖς Θεοῦ IN LATE JUDAISM IN THE PERIOD AFTER THE LXX</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>1 THE TWOFOLD MEANING OF Παῖς Θεοῦ</b>	<b>43</b>
i Παῖς Θεοῦ = child of God	43
ii Παῖς Θεοῦ = servant of God	44
<b>2 THE PERSISTENCE OF THE O.T. RELIGIOUS USAGE OF עָבֵד יְהוָה</b>	<b>45</b>

i Παῖς Θεοῦ as self-descriptive of the worshipper	45
ii The plural 'servants of God'	46
iii The collective linguistic use	47
iv Παῖς Θεοῦ as a title of honour for outstanding instruments of God	48
v 'Servant of God' as denoting the Messiah	49
<b>3 INTERPRETATIONS OF DEUTERO-ISAIAH 'SERVANT OF GOD' PASSAGES</b>	
i Hellenistic Judaism	50
ii Palestinian Judaism	51
(a) The collective interpretation	54
(b) Application for the prophet Isaiah	55
(c) Messianic exegesis	57
<i>Jeremias</i>	
<b>IV Παῖς Θεοῦ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT</b>	79
<b>1 Παῖς Θεοῦ AS A TITLE OF JESUS</b>	80
i The origin of the title	80
ii The meaning of the predication	85
iii The semantic change from 'servant of God' to 'child of God'	86
<b>2 CHRISTOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH SERVANT OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT</b>	88
i The evidence	88
ii The historical setting in the life of the early church	94
<b>3 CAN JESUS HAVE KNOWN HIMSELF TO BE THE SERVANT OF GOD?</b>	98
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	vii
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	105
<b>INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES</b>	109

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

'A	Aquila's translation
'Αλλ	The column of the <i>Hexapla</i> called ἄλλος
AOB	H. Gressmann, <i>Altorientalische Bilder zum AT</i> <sup>2</sup>
BFT	<i>Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie</i>
BHK	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> , ed. Kittel <sup>2</sup> (1909); <sup>3</sup> (1929 ff.)
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
DT	<i>Deutsche Theologie</i>
ET	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRL	<i>Forschungen zum Religion und Literatur des AT und NT</i>
GCS	<i>Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i>
HNT	<i>Handbuch zum NT</i>
HSAT	<i>Heilige Schriften des AT</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Meyer	Kritisch-Exegetisches Kommentar über das NT, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer
MGWJ	<i>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
M.T.	Massoretic Text
NGG	<i>Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen</i>
NKZ	<i>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studien</i>
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RE	<i>Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
RTP	<i>Revue Theologie et de Philosophie</i>
Σ	Symmachus' translation
SAB	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin</i>
SAH	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
S.-B.	H. L. Strack-Paul Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Talmud und Midrasch</i> , I, 1922 II, 1924
s.v.	<i>sub voce</i>
Θ	Theodotion's translation
TB	<i>Theologische Blätter</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TR	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TSK	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
TWNT	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZST	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## I

## THE OLD TESTAMENT

## 1. THE PROFANE USE OF THE TITLE עָבֵד

The noun **עבד** is to be derived from the verb **עבד**, which no doubt originally means 'to work'.<sup>1</sup> In regard to the noun, however, it is striking to what a considerable extent the actual meaning of the root has weakened<sup>2</sup> and been replaced by the idea of a specific personal relationship. Not 'the idle' but אֲדֹן 'the Lord' is the counterpart expressed or unexpressed of **עבד**.<sup>3</sup> **עבד** is the worker who belongs to a master. The whole rich development of the **עבד** idea begins with this sense of belonging. The suffix or construct formations but also the less frequent loose link with **ל** all point not to the object that is produced by the worker but to the Lord who bids the work be done.<sup>4</sup> In particular, the following chief modes of employment of the word **עבד** can be distinguished:

(i) **עבד**—*the slave*, the man who is characterized above all by the fact that he belongs to another.<sup>5</sup> The slave appears to be the one who has completely become property. But O.T. law can point to the fact that in Israel limits are set to this victimization.

<sup>1</sup>Noeldeke, review of F. Delitzsch, 'Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A.T.', *ZDMG*, 40, 1886, 741; W. J. Gerber, *Die hebr. Verba denominativa*, 1896, 14–16; Lindhagen, 41–42.

<sup>2</sup>There is still a trace of it, for example, in Job 7.2 or in I Kings 9.22 where in Origen's supplement the תְּהִלָּה **עבד** of the O.T. is translated by ἔδωκεν εἰς πρᾶγμα.

<sup>3</sup>This is beautifully clear in Lev. 25, where v.39 forbids that a brother who has fallen into bondage should be given **עבד**—work, while v. 40 assumes as a matter of course that he will work (**עבד**).

<sup>4</sup>Thus one can indeed speak verbally of an **עבד אָדָם** (Gen. 4.2; Zech. 13.5; Prov. 12.11; 28.19) but never of an **עבד אָדָם** in the sense of a tiller of the soil. The verb **עבד** with the meaning 'serve' as derived from the noun should be termed secondary. For its usage see Gerber, loc. cit. in n. 1. The obvious weakness of the work of Lindhagen (cf. especially n. 41) lies in the unnoticed confusion of the noun **עבד** and the verb **עבד** on which in fact is based his memorandum of the **עבד** passages in the O.T.

<sup>5</sup>Most plainly in the enumerations of possessions, for example in Gen. 20.14; 24.35; 30.43; 32.5, and elsewhere, or in the extremely unsentimental **כַּפְרְתָה הוּא** of Ex. 21.21 (cf. also Lev. 22.11).

The slave has rights as a human being. Thus, in contradistinction to Babylonian law, for example, any injury done to a slave must be compensated by his release.<sup>6</sup> In O.T. slave law there are no punishments by mutilation.<sup>7</sup> The slave who has escaped from another master is not to be surrendered.<sup>8</sup> This greater dignity and freedom of the slave were assisted by the fact that the slave shared in the common cultic life in O.T. faith, directed as it was to community and the people of God.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, Israel itself was conscious from the start that it owed its own whole existence to an act of deliverance from Egypt, the 'house of bondage' (Ex. 20.2; Deut. 5.6; 6.12, etc.). Lev. 25.42 is able to show how clearly Israel's consequent sense of belonging to Yahweh can assure to her slaves at least the right to live. Gen. 24 narrates the finest slave story in the O.T. The name of its hero is never indicated, but he is referred to simply as עָבֶד אַבְרָהָם or more briefly as עָבֶד הָעָבֶד.<sup>10</sup> His action is determined wholly by the cult-communion of the house of his master. God is for him 'the God of my master Abraham' (vv. 12, 27, 42, 48). Within that setting an utterly free type of service is possible; the עָבֶד acts in his business of wooing a bride for Abraham's son as effectually as though Abraham himself were present. He is the full representative of his master and remains nevertheless the submissive, nameless servant who does not even permit himself the humanly very understandable respite at the scene of his successful mission (vv. 54 ff.).

(ii) *The עָבֶד in the service of the king.* The need of repelling the professional army of the Philistines made it necessary in Israel, from the time of Saul onwards, for the king who normally had at his disposal only a voluntary army, to form for himself a paid standing army.<sup>11</sup> Whoever entered the latter seceded from

<sup>6</sup> Ex. 21.26 f.; cf. *Codex Hammurabi*, § 199, 213.

<sup>7</sup> *Codex Hammurabi*, § 205, 282.

<sup>8</sup> Deut. 23.16; cf. *Codex Hammurabi*, § 15-20.

<sup>9</sup> Sacrifice, Deut. 12.12, 18; sabbath, Ex. 20.10; Deut. 5.14; passover, Ex. 12.44; circumcision, Gen. 17.13, 27. In Lev. 22.11, although the עָבֶד title is missing, the fact is very clearly expressed.

<sup>10</sup> עָבֶד אַבְרָהָם vv. 34, 52, 59; עָבֶד הָעָבֶד vv. 5, 9, 10, 17, etc.; v. 2 represents him as עָבֶד זָקֵן בֵּיתוֹ חֲמִשֵּׁל בְּכָל־אָשָׁר לוּ. The reader of the extant Abraham stories as a whole will think of Eliezer, mentioned in Gen. 15.2.

<sup>11</sup> I Sam. 14.52; cf. especially A. Alt, *Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina*, 1930, 33 f.; E. Junge, *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia*, 1937, 8-22.

*The Servant of God in the Old Testament*

natural tribal membership and became עָבֵד הַמֶּלֶךְ.<sup>12</sup> It would not be appropriate to speak in this matter of slavery, since service with the king probably was based upon a firm agreement whereby the king too bound himself to reciprocal duties.<sup>13</sup> The עָבֵד was spoken of in this connexion because here again a clear relationship of belonging, which superseded all previous relationships of the kind, was what determined the status of these royal servants. With the increasing elaboration of the monarchy and the creation of further groups of officials the use of the עָבֵד-idea was extended. All functionaries dependent on the king could be summarily designated 'servants of the king'.<sup>14</sup> Finally, the bearer of an important unique office at the court, whose functions unfortunately are not made plain in the sole reference to him, II Kings 22.12 (II Chron. 34.20), seems to have carried the title עָבֵד הַמֶּלֶךְ in a very special sense.<sup>15</sup>

II עָבֵד אִישׁ-בֶּשֶׂת בֶּן-שָׁאוֹל I עָבֵד שָׁאוֹל<sup>12</sup>  
II Sam. 2.1; 22.9 etc.; II Sam. 2.12; עָבֵד דָּרוֹם II Sam. 2.13, 15, 17, etc.

<sup>12</sup>I Sam. 22.7; the king's right—an ambiguous title—overshadows the voluntary nature of the עָבֵד, but there is talk of recompense in I Sam. 8.14 f. Here and in what follows we may compare with the Arab. *bai*-covenant (J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, 1914, 52–63). On the other hand, it is hardly correct to characterize the עָבֵד-relationship outright, hence every slave relationship, as a בְּרִית-relationship of a *bai*-type' (Lindhagen, 53). However much in Israel the religious עָבֵד-relationship can be fitted into the בְּרִית-relationship of Israel, the religious עָבֵד-statements receiving a special stamp, the בְּרִית- and the עָבֵד-relationships are originally different structures.

<sup>14</sup>Thus already in the time of Saul an עָבֵד seems to have had special charge of the flocks, I Sam. 21.7. The steward Ziba is termed עָבֵד in II Sam. 9.2 (cf. v. 9)—is that an early form of the household office I עַל-הַבַּיִת I Kings 4.6; 16.9? He himself again has עָבְדִים at his disposal. The counsellors of Saul are so named in I Sam. 16.15. The circle of those courtiers not involved in the war at the time of David is called עָבֵד II Sam. 11.9, 13; also David's counsellor (II Sam. 15.34) and ambassadors are so named (II Sam. 10.2–4). A comparison of the parallel texts II Kings 19.23 and Isa. 37.24 shows that עָבֵד can be simply replaced by מֶלֶךְ. In I Kings 11.26 Jeroboam, Solomon's overseer of labour, is called עָבֵד; cf. II Chron. 13.6.

<sup>15</sup>If Jeroboam named in the inscription of the fine seal found in Megiddo שְׁמֻעָה עָבֵד יְרִבְעָם were one of the kings of this name (*AOB*<sup>2</sup>, fig. 578, cf. K. Galliing, 'Beschriftete Bildsiegel des I. Jahrtausends', *ZDPV* 64, 1941, 121–202 No. 17), if the עֲזִיז and אֲחֹז of the seal inscriptions Galliing No. 85 and 125, especially 1a, should mean king Uzziah and Ahaz, then possibly we should have here further allusions to this courtly title which is perhaps directly cited on the seal Galliing No. 43 לִיאוֹנִיה (עָבֵד הַמֶּלֶךְ). Cf. further p. 30, n. 92; D. Diringer, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi*, 1934, 229–231; Lindhagen, 36–39.

at this late period by their once personal relation as **לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי**.  
 Ezra 2,53; 58; Neh. 7,57, 60; 11,3, who from the time of Solomon must have been  
 appointed to a specific temple service. But it is significant that they are characterized  
 mention of such people would be most expected, we have a group of **לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי**,  
 "In the enumeration of the sanctuary servants of Ezra 2 and Neh. 7, where a

**לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי** 252, cf. 250 f., 253 f.

**לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי** 252 **Copius Inscriptionum Semiticarum**, I, 1, 1881, No. 247-9,  
 (Handbuch 2, AT, I, 7), 1938, 29-33.

Is the now intervening, however, of wood and drawers of water a gloss or  
 original? Probably the sanctuary in Gilgal is in question. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*

1938, the Amarna letters see Lindhabergen, 7-30. Further Lande (op. cit.)

Torczyne, *The Lachish Letters*, 1938, 36 f., 92 f., 104 f.

For the arduousness of the Amarna letters see Lindhabergen, 7-30. Further Lande (op. cit.)

myself, C. J. A. Kaudzow, *Die El-Amara-Tafeln*, 1915, 60, 6 f.; 71, 17 f.; 83, 64.

boeth, "What is thy servant that you should have turned to such a dead dog as

For example Hazael, II Kings 8,13; thy servant the dog" or II Sam. 9,8, Mephi-

spacker stands the polite reference to a third party by the speaker as **לְבָבֶךָ**.

intercourse, TWNT, II, 270, n. 40-42. Alongside the polite self-reference of the

Wandlungen der Umgangssprache im AT, 1949, 68-71; for courtesies in diplomatic

II, Kohler, "Archaeologisches", ZAW, 40, 1922, 43f.; I. Lande, *Formelhaftie-*

maed for help II Kings 16,7: **לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי**, see TWNT, II, 270, 13.

9,11; cf. I Kings 20,32; II Kings 10,5. For the fuller formula of subsection and de-

16Thus the Gibonites come with the formula of subsection **לְבָבֶךָ תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי** Josh.

for an answer to the question about the emergence of a temple

God, 20 are lacking in the O.T. 21 This is significant, not merely

to be found in Cartaginian inscriptions, 22 of the house of

suggests a personal relationship. Parallels to the formula often

regard the O.T. as a whole, what strikes us is how plainly **לְבָבֶךָ**

Josua dooms the Gibonites to be **לְבָבֶךָ נַפְתַּח תְּצַדֵּקְתִּי**. 23 But if we

should be mentioned as a special group. According to Josh. 9,23

(v) *The sanctuary servants*. Perhaps the sanctuary servants

be added which emphasize overmuch the element of meek-

ness. 24

(iv) **לְבָבֶךָ** as a humble self-description. From the language of the

court self-reference as **לְבָבֶךָ** has penetrated as an expression of

humility into everyday polite speech. 25 Here at times words may

is always latent therein the implication of humility at

scribed as **לְבָבֶךָ** (II Sam. 10,19; cf. II Kings 18,24). But always

**לְבָבֶךָ** denotes one who is subject and belongs to a master. There

is indeed submission. 26 In this connection even kings can be de-

politicical submission. 27 Is used to express quite generally the idea of

indeinitely **לְבָבֶךָ** is used to express quite generally the idea of

(iii) **לְבָבֶךָ** as a description of political submission. More widely and

times comes out unexpectedly in plain lament (Lam. 5,8).

## The Servant of God in the Old Testament

capitalism, but equally for the appraisement of עָבֵד-passages in the O.T. עָבֵד is a person who belongs to a person.

### 2. עָבֵד IN RELIGIOUS USAGE

In the religious usage of עָבֵד are to be found the same three constructions of phrase as in profane usage, together with the construct formation עָבֵד יְהוָה,<sup>22</sup> the grouping with a suffix in all three persons, more seldom the combination with ל.<sup>23</sup>

(i) *עָבֵד as the humble self-description of the pious in the presence of his God.* The connexion with secular usage can be seen most plainly in the pious man's meek description of himself as he stands in the presence of his God. Just as the inferior, in speaking to the superior, refers to himself humbly as 'thy servant' in the third person, this manner of speech is all the more appropriate when man stands in the presence of God.<sup>24</sup> In this connexion the expression can assume varying emphases. First, in many passages the simple, humble confession of the lowly status of the speaker before his great Lord can be uppermost.<sup>25</sup> Next, from this expres-

<sup>22</sup> Thus twenty-one times. Plur. עָבְדי יְהוָה. Only in later times is to be found also during the process of the displacement of the Yahweh name עָבֵד הָאֱלֹהִים, I Chron. 6.49; II Chron. 24.9; Neh. 10.29; Dan. 9.11. Once in an older text we can recognize the penetration of the Father-God title; in Gen. 50.17 the brothers in the presence of Joseph describe themselves as עָבְדי אֱלֹהִי אָבִיכֶם; in the Aram. Dan. Darius describes Daniel as עָבֵד אֱלֹהִים חָנָן, 6.21; elsewhere the three friends are described as עָבְדוּתִי דַי אֱלֹהִים עַלְיאָה, 3.26. In the Aram. Ezra 5.11 we find in the address to the Persian governor the Jews representing themselves as עָבְדוּתִי דַי אֱלֹהִ שְׁמַיָּא וְאֶרְעָא.

<sup>23</sup> עָבְדוּ 62 times; עָבְדִי 17 times; עָבְדֶךָ 92 times; עָבְדִיךָ 20 times; ל. sing. Isa. 44.21; 49.5 f.; plur. 56.6; Lev. 25.55.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. esp. Baudissin, 'Kyrios', TWNT, III, 524-55. The similarity between this polite mode of address and the language of religious worship stands out most clearly in those passages where one wonders whether the speaker is aware that he stands in the presence of the divine Lord. In Gen. 18.3, 5 the original text may well have implied that Abraham did not yet recognize Yahweh among his three visitors and hence offered his greetings in the style of polite speech. But the M.T. by its vocalization אָדָנִי in v. 3 wishes to express the idea that Abraham is aware of his encounter with God. Clearly any change in the style of address was not thought necessary.

<sup>25</sup> Moses, Ex. 4.10; Num. 11.11; Deut. 3.24. Curiously enough the עָבֵד-title is missing in Abraham's strong expressions of self depreciation, Gen. 18.27. If H. Torczyner is right in his proposed change of text בְּעָבוּר עָבְדֶךָ וְכַלְבָךְ 'Dunkle

sion of humble submission can be heard a certain claim. As in the mouth of Ahaz the formula of subjection turned into the request 'I am thy servant and thy son: come up, and save me' (II Kings 16.7), so the same thing can happen in addressing God. He who confesses allegiance to a master withdraws himself from the dominion of all other possible masters, and so with inner justification can request the master whose allegiance he owns to be careful for his part to preserve his power and to protect his servant. In this sort of situation the honour of the divine Lord is at stake.<sup>26</sup> If in this supplicating approach to the Lord man's own performance is stressed (but I am your worshipper) then the self-description **עָבֵד** acquires a strongly active tone. If, on the contrary, the already experienced favour of God is emphasized, then the name **עָבֵד** marks the attitude of thankful self-surrender.<sup>27</sup>

What has so far been shown is in no way peculiar to the O.T. These features of pious self-description as **עָבֵד** (*Babylonian ardu*) are to be found in exactly the same way in the world surrounding Israel. But three further points are to be noted which characterize the O.T. encounter with God and render intelligible how the O.T. understanding of **עָבֵד** could undergo its own peculiarly rich development.

O.T. faith springs from the encounter with Yahweh the jealous Lord (Ex 20.5; 34.14; Deut. 4.24; 5.9; 6.15; Josh. 24.19; Nahum 1.2). When Ashurbanipal owns himself the servant of Nebo,<sup>28</sup> but at the next New Year's feast again grasps the hands of his land-god

Bibelstellen', in *Festschr. K. Marti*, = *ZAW*, Beiheft 41, 1925, 275), then we should have here in the language of prayer the use of the formula of humility common in profane speech: your servant and dog. Since this type of humble self-expression, which is really de-personalizing, occurs nowhere else in O.T. religious language—is it merely an accident?—there must be doubts about Torczyner's reconstruction of the text.

<sup>26</sup> Ps. 143.11 f. 'Quicken me, O Lord, for thy name's sake . . . destroy all them that afflict me; for I am thy servant.' Cf. the Babylonian: 'Quicken thy servant, who wishes to exalt thy power and praise thy greatness among all men', W. Schrank, *Babylonische Silberriten*, 1908, 56.

<sup>27</sup> Thus for example the inscription on a votive pillar of Malta: 'To our Lord Melkart, the Lord of Tyre, from your devotees your servant (**עָבֵד**) Abdosir and my brother Osirshamar, son of Osirshamar, son of Abdosir, for he has heard their voice. May he bless them.' *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, I, 1, 1881, No. 122.

<sup>28</sup> J. Pinckert, *Hymnen und Gebete an Nebo*, 1920, 16 ff. The text is not quite certain in 1.5. But that does not affect the fundamental principle here asserted.

## *The Servant of God in the Old Testament*

Ashur and is again invested by him with his sovereign rights, this self-description as the servant of Nebo cannot be understood in an exclusive sense. In Israel, on the other hand, the self-description of the pious man as עָבֵד יְהוָה is characterized by its total claim. The thought 'no man can serve two masters' embraces not merely the moment of the worshipful turning towards God but the whole of life. Alongside it no other עָבֵד-status is conceivable. The seriousness of this attitude becomes manifest on both sides: Yahweh claims the total obedience of his servant and the latter even in the hour of bitterest trial may claim the protection of this exclusive allegiance.

O.T. faith is aware of a primal inclination of Yahweh to Israel arising from the free grace of Yahweh. In regard to the development of the expression עָבֵד יְהוָה this implies that this inclination cannot be realized conclusively in the sphere of individual piety or even in that of any local cult. It stands related to the event of Israel as a whole. The individual can become the servant of Yahweh only in so far as he is a member of Israel; for the will of Yahweh is directed toward Israel. It has become manifest in the deliverance from Egypt and the conclusion of the covenant which followed from it and of which Israel speaks from the earliest times. The servant status of the pious man is to be understood from within the sphere of this relationship which was created not by man but by Yahweh.

O.T. faith realizes that the encounter with Yahweh took place in the midst of history and that it points to an historical goal. Thus the servant character remains not within the timeless sphere of individual piety but gains special importance where Yahweh in his historical meeting with his people calls individuals to some special service.

If we turn now from these conclusions to consider again the humble self-description of the pious which occurs in the O.T., we shall find intelligible the note of ardent trust in the expression. The עָבֵד state is not one which the pious man has attained through his own achievement or which rests on sacrifices and good works alone. The self-description עָבֶד gains its security from being felt to be an echo of a call which originally was uttered by the mouth of Yahweh himself. Thus, in Num. 12.7 f. Yahweh says in emphatic and repeated affirmation of Moses: 'My servant

Moses'.<sup>29</sup> But it is also to be heard on the lips of the simple anonymous man of prayer: 'Let thy merciful kindness (**דָּבָר**) be for my comfort, according to thy word unto thy servant' (Ps. 119.76). The petitioner dares, on the strength of a word from Yahweh which was directed to him, to approach Yahweh as a servant. The word which the O.T. worshipper hears becomes, however, again and again a word of commanding guidance on the part of the covenant God.<sup>30</sup> 'I have gone astray like a lost sheep; seek thy servant, for I do not forget thy commandments' (Ps. 119.176; cf. vv. 17, 23, 135, 140). The servant is he who is obedient to the command of God. But the servant **עָבֵד יְהוָה** will also have enemies who are especially sinister because they at the same time embody enmity to Yahweh. Hence the title **עָבֵד** may explicitly or implicitly be contrasted with the counter word 'my enemies' (thy, Yahweh's, enemies). 'Let them curse, but bless thou: when they arise let them be ashamed; but let thy servant rejoice' (Ps. 109.28).<sup>31</sup>

(ii) '*Servants of Yahweh*' in the plural as denoting the pious. The expression **עָבֹד יְהוָה** on account of its inner depth acquires great force in the O.T. It is not merely a conventional formula for the individual pious man<sup>32</sup> and can be freely used in the plural to denote the pious as a whole.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> As also of Caleb, Num. 14.24, further of David, Isaiah, Eliakim, Nebuchadnezzar etc. It is significant that as against **עָבֶד** occurring 92 times in the mouth of the petitioner, **עָבֶד יְהוָה** occurs in the mouth of Yahweh as many as 62 times (in the plural 20 **עָבְדִים** to 17 **עָבְדָךְ**).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. for example Ps. 50 or the torah Psalms 15 and 24.

<sup>31</sup> It is not necessary in this connexion to discuss the problem of the 'enemies' in the Psalms.

<sup>32</sup> In the world of the ancient Near East surrounding Israel the **עָבֶד** title seems to have been mainly used in this formula of humble self-description and in the giving of names. The Malta inscription quoted in n. 27, p. 14, above, may perhaps give us some idea of the rigidity of this type of formula. Although two benefactors are there named they do not dare to use the formula in the plural but say clumsily 'Thy servant and my brother'. As for the giving of names cf. especially the rich material in Baudissin, 'Kyrios', *TWNT*, III, 531–48. For Ras Shamra see Lindhagen, 30–31. For O.T. giving of names M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsam-syrischen Namengabeung*, 1928, 137–38. In Karatepe 'z̄twd is denoted as **עָבֶד בָּעֵל** (A. Alt, 'Die phönizischen Inschriften von Karatepe', in *Die Welt des Orients*, 1949, 272–87).

<sup>33</sup> Ps. 113.1 and 135.1 f. mention the worshipping community in the temple or the circle of priests, 134.1 mentions a vigil. Ps. 112.1 LXX (**παῖδες**), 'A, Σ, Θ (**δοῦλοι**) and 134.1 LXX (**δοῦλοι**) seem to use the description 'your servants' absolutely and the construct state **עָבֶד יְהוָה** is misunderstood (**αὐτεῖτε, παῖδες, κύριον**). The Hebrew text knows nothing of the absolute use.

Synonymous parallels may elucidate for us their inner meaning. Servants of Yahweh are those who 'seek refuge in him' (Ps. 34.22), who 'love his name' (Ps. 69.36)—here the possession of the land of Yahweh's inheritance is ascribed to the servants of Yahweh, his saints (=those who are bound to him in חסֵד, Ps. 79.2). Or most briefly and pregnantly: 'his people' (Ps. 105.25; 135.14). Here plainly an allusion to divine election is linked with the עבד thought.<sup>34</sup> In Trit. Isa. the cleavage of the community into servants and enemies of Yahweh is strongly emphasized (Isa. 65.13 ff.). Further, the two poles of the עבד idea are clearly recognizable. Isa. 56.6 describes obedience to the laws of the covenant as the basis of the עבד status, while 65.9, by equating servants of Yahweh and 'elect', lays all the emphasis on the divine election. These elect are the visible pledge of the gracious favour of Yahweh. 'So will I do for my servants' sake' is his own gracious promise (Isa. 65.8).

(iii) *עבד יהוה in the singular as a description of Israel.* This humble self-description of the individual saint leads to the characterization of Israel in the singular as the עבד יהוה which probably started with Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>35</sup> The latter formulates most of his words of promise in the style of the priestly oracles of deliverance.<sup>36</sup> The promise given by the priest to the suppliant corresponds closely in style to the lament with which the suppliant approaches his God.<sup>37</sup> Thus the oracle takes up the liturgical word usual in such individual laments, 'I am thy servant', and embeds it in the quite new context of the comforting divine assurance: 'But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, seed of Abraham my friend; thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant, I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away.'<sup>38</sup>

<sup>34</sup>Lindhagen, 153-5.

<sup>35</sup>If we take the mention in Jer. 30.10 (see p. 18, n. 41, below) as original then we find the beginning of this development in Jer. In that case the slender amount of testimony to this impressive new use in Jer. is striking. Is it that Jer. found it in a tradition of prophetic language unknown to us and used it only incidentally? The striking freshness which the phrase has in Deut. Isa. seems to me to point to the fact that its manifestation here is an innovation.

<sup>36</sup>Begrich, *Heilsorakel*, 81-92, and *Studien*, 6-19, 137, 140 f.

<sup>37</sup>H. Gunkel-J. Begrich, *Einf. in die Ps.*, 1933, par. 6, cf. also par. 4.

<sup>38</sup>Isa. 41.8 ff. Cf. further 44.1 f; 45.4. In the exhortatory word 44.21. In a brief allusion 48.20.

The title is transformed in the mouth of Yahweh. No longer does there stand in the foreground the humble confession of the people crushed in exile (conceived by this prophet in full personal terms as an individual figure), but the powerful, gracious use of it by Yahweh. In statements which go far beyond the concept master-servant and are not levelled out, the idea of belonging utterly to Yahweh by grace is brought to expression. Israel the **עָבֵד יְהוָה** has been created by Yahweh (44.2, 21), chosen by him (41.8 f.; 44.1; 45.4), fetched from the ends of the earth (41.9), and is the seed of Abraham the friend of God (41.8). With the formula already found in the Babylonian oracles of favour, she is urged to be fearless (44.2). Yahweh promises her help, indeed, the help of ransom secured to the blood relation (48.20).<sup>39</sup> There is no talk of any initiative to be taken by the servant Israel herself. If 42.19 refers to Israel then she is even declared to be utterly blind (cf. 43.8). The witnessing to the power of Yahweh which she is summoned to undertake<sup>40</sup> is that of a passive recipient of a gift. 'To return'—that is the sole activity to which the people is summoned (44.22); to return in view of the saving deed which Yahweh alone has accomplished.<sup>41</sup>

(iv) **עָבֵד יְהוָה** as a title for specially distinguished figures. Yahweh made contact with his people Israel in history, and held them to history as the place where he is near and where responsible decision is made. Hence it is not surprising that O.T. faith again and again sees in history figures whom it recognizes pre-eminently as

<sup>39</sup> J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im AT*, 1940, 27–45.

<sup>40</sup> 43.10. It is debatable whether here by **עָבֵד** Israel is meant or an individual figure alongside the people.

<sup>41</sup> The style of Deut. Isa. is echoed in Jer. 30.10 (par. 46.27 f.), cf. p. 17, n. 35. In Ezek. 28.25; 37.25 it is a question whether by the servant is meant the patriarch Jacob or the people. In the similar expression in Ps. 136.22, which uses the name Israel, it is clear on the other hand that the people is indicated. This is the text where Lindhagen most dangerously misleads. Since in his examination he does not distinguish noun and verb, he is unable to see the narrowly defined limits within which alone the singular **עָבֵד** title is used for Israel. The abundant use of the verbal **עָבַד** for Israel conceals them from him. Consequently the whole arrangement of his study gives the impression that the talk about the servant of Yahweh applies to Israel in the first instance (the major section goes under the heading 'Israel as Yahweh's Servant', 82–233), and only secondarily do individual pious men bear the title **עָבֵד יְהוָה** (233–62 deals with the nucleus of pious as **עָבֵד יְהוָה**, 262–88 with 'The Servant as Individual Members of the People of Israel'). The real state of affairs for the substantial use of **עָבֵד** is exactly the opposite.

servants of Yahweh. We must now consider these outstanding representatives of the **עָבֶד יְהוָה** status. It is to be expected from the outset that profane courtly usage, which is also aware of these pre-eminent and marked **עָבֶד** figures as contrasted with the general use of the title, will not have been without influence.

(a) Israel finds the beginnings of its history embodied in the figures of the patriarchs. In them the gracious character of Yahweh's revelation,<sup>42</sup> which began long before Israel was a people, is expressed most clearly. Thus it is to be understood that wherever the fathers are spoken of as servants of Yahweh, the idea of a gracious relationship to Yahweh is clearly presupposed. The patriarchs are pledges of the divine will to save. Yahweh promises blessing to Isaac for the sake of Abraham his servant.<sup>43</sup> In a specially dark hour for the people Moses implores Yahweh by reminding him of the oath which he sware to the fathers whom he names.

(b) Moses stands on the threshold of the people's history. Forty times in the M.T. the name of **עָבֶד** is given to him. Two pre-Deuteronomic passages do so with especial emphasis. In Num. 12.7 f. Moses is differentiated by a divine explanation from those prophets who know God only in a dream or vision. 'Not so is my servant Moses, who is faithful in all mine house. With him I speak mouth to mouth . . . wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?' Moses is the vizier, the true steward of Yahweh. We are reminded of the faithful servant of Abraham (cf. p. 10). In Ex. 14.31 J, after Israel had been saved at the Red Sea by the leadership of Moses 'then they believed Yahweh and Moses his servant.' Moses is only Yahweh's servant. But in what he powerfully accomplished Yahweh was so obviously present that the people's responsive faith submits to Moses and to Yahweh in him. An essential feature of the biblical revelation comes out here. God's history is not transcendental heavenly history. It stoops to earth and

<sup>42</sup>So at least according to the popular tradition which is especially manifest in Gen. Otherwise with the prophets: Hos. 12.3 ff.; Jer. 9.4; Isa. 43.27.

<sup>43</sup>Gen. 26.24, cf. Ps. 105.6, 42. Only in the speech of Abraham's servant is Isaac called 'servant of Yahweh' (Gen. 24.14). In the mention of the name Jacob, the difficulty is in each case to decide whether the patriarch Jacob is designated, or the people called after him. See n. 41. Cf. in I Chron. 16.13 the distorted quotation from Ps. 105.6.

appoints men with their deeds and words as its signs. Moses, Yahweh's servant, embodies in his activity such a part of divine history. Obedience or disobedience to his word is decisive for men's attitude to Yahweh. Moses is much more emphatically than the patriarchs an active servant-figure. He shapes the law (Josh. 1.2, 7; II Kings 18.12; Mal. 4.4, etc.), orders particular matters with regard to the possession of the land (Josh. 1.13, 15; 8.31), prescribes cultic matters (II Chron. 1.3; 24.6), and promises coming peace in the land (I Kings 8.53, 56). But behind it all stands the election of Yahweh who appoints to him and Aaron their service.<sup>44</sup>

(c) The further series of servants of Yahweh can be clearly divided into two lines of development. First, the king, who has to perform an outstanding service in Israel. 'By the hand of my servant David I will save my people Israel out of the hand of the Philistines and out of the hand of their enemies', is Yahweh's word in the certainly pre-Deuteronomic text of II Sam. 3.18. The king is the servant of Yahweh with the special duty of saving the people of God out of the hand of their enemies—but not every king. From the promise to Nathan we see a second development; David, in virtue of a special bond of grace, is the pre-eminent king of the holy people. Hence in the Deuteronomic history, where the description of David as עֶבֶד יְהוָה is especially frequent, the blameless obedience of David can be strongly emphasized, and also the duty of the servant in regard to meritoriousness. But only in appearance. The same Deuteronomic history especially stresses the basic fact of divine election<sup>45</sup> which again shows the Davidic monarchy to be a pure gift of grace. I Kings 11.34 combines the two factors into a tense duality: 'David my servant, whom I chose because he kept my commandments and my statutes.' The more their history

<sup>44</sup>Cf. the parallel statement in Ps. 105.26. In the after-glow of the story of Moses, Joshua also can once (Josh. 24.29=Judg. 2.8), as the one who completes the work of Moses, be called 'Servant of Yahweh'. In the case of Caleb the faithful informant (Num. 14.24), on the other hand, the thought of obedience is stressed.

<sup>45</sup>I Kings 11.13, 32 names, in conjunction, David and the chosen city of Jerusalem as the pledge of Yahweh's fidelity. For the background of religious worship behind this association cf. H. J. Kraus, *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im A.T.*, 1951, 58 f. I Kings 11.36 and II Kings 8.19 mention the will of Yahweh to give David a lamp. II Kings 19.34 and 20.6 formulate most strongly the significance of David as the divinely ordained symbol of salvation: 'For my . . . and my servant David's sake' Yahweh wills to help.

runs into disaster the more intensely O.T. faith clings to the figure of David, the servant of God, as a token of promise. It waits for the day when this servant will again be king (Ezek. 34.23 f.; 37.24 f.). It reminds Yahweh of the oath which he sware to his chosen servant David (Ps. 89.3; cf. v. 20). It speaks of the indissoluble bond which Yahweh made with his servant David (Jer. 33.21 f., 26).<sup>46</sup> Immediately after the exile we see the same hope flare up. The post-exilic successor of David, Zerubbabel, who in Zech. 3.8 is described with the secret messianic title **מֶמֶּה עָבֵד יְהוָה**, gains here and in Hag. 2.23, from the mouth of Yahweh, the additional title of honour **עָבֵד יְהוָה**.<sup>47</sup> Jer. 25.9; 27.6; 43.10, show<sup>48</sup> that the description of a king as **עָבֵד יְהוָה** even in the context of prophetic declaration of judgement, can have a peculiar emphasis. In Nebuchadnezzar the stern holiness of Yahweh appointed, with limited mission, a royal servant who was foreign to Israel. Here too the divine will expresses itself through the servant in human form. Whoever resists Nebuchadnezzar, resists Yahweh (Jer. 27-29).

(d) The line of prophets stands beside that of kings. The prophet is Yahweh's word-messenger. The office of messenger existed in the royal service too.<sup>49</sup> The report of David's embassy to Hanun (II Sam. 10.2 ff.) shows clearly how closely the honour of the messenger is bound up with that of the king. From I Kings 18.36 we can see that the same thing applies to the servant of God. Elijah prays on Carmel: 'Yahweh God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done

<sup>46</sup> How closely the cause of Yahweh, and that of his royal servant of the lineage of David, are bound up together is shown by the statement about Sennacherib's messengers, who speak against the Lord 'and against his servant Hezekiah' II Chron. 32.16 (still more strongly expressed, without the use of **עָבֵד** in I Chron. 28.5; 29.23; II Chron. 13.18). Yahweh's honour is involved in the affair of Hezekiah. Cf. what was said about Ex. 14.31 on p. 19.

<sup>47</sup> An unknown Davidite; Ps. 89.39, 50. Cf. also I Kings 8.30, 36 (corrected text), 52, 59.

<sup>48</sup> But the pre-hexaplar LXX reads **עָבֵד יְהוָה** only in the second passage (**δουλεύειν αὐτῷ ως עָבֵד**?). The statement about Nebuchadnezzar sounds so peculiar that it is not likely to be a new formation of later times. Since intrinsically it fits best with the oracles of Jeremiah its invention by the latter is the most satisfactory supposition.

<sup>49</sup> For the alternation of **עָבֵד** and **מֶלֶךְ** see p. 11, n. 14 above. Isa. 44.26 (amended text) shows a corresponding parallel for the office of the prophetic messenger of God, Job 4.18 for that of heavenly messenger.

all these things at thy word.' Yahweh's history is again present in the midst of men through his authorized messenger. The knowledge of God depends upon the knowledge of his servant. In the Deuteronomic writing of history, the prophet gains an almost instrumental significance. Constantly his teaching reveals the course of history as a redemption of the divine pledges made in prophecy.<sup>50</sup> Thus Ahijah of Shiloh (I Kings 14.18; 15.29), Elijah (II Kings 9.36; 10.10) and Jonah ben Amitai—as prophet of good things—(II Kings 14.25) are described as servants of Yahweh.<sup>51</sup> In the wider range of Deuteronomic writing the usual formula of ““my” (“thy”, “his”) servants the prophets’ has crystallized into a cliché. It becomes a firm mode of thought employed mostly in a specific type of theological context. These messengers are the great admonishers of the people<sup>52</sup> sent by Yahweh, without intermission. In all these passages there comes to the fore a definite active mission on the part of the servant. The parallel with the royal court can be specially clearly seen here. To the heavenly court of Yahweh belong these servants who perform his commissions on earth. Job 4.18 adds the thought of the heavenly messengers with their appointed tasks.<sup>53</sup>

In the older narratives (especially of Elisha) seer and prophet are given the probably pre-exilic title<sup>54</sup> אִישׁ הָלֹהִים.<sup>55</sup> The subsequent replacement of this by עָבֵד might well have been due to the desire to see the weaker אֱלֹהִים supplanted by יְהוָה,<sup>56</sup> but even more the unrelated אִישׁ supplanted by עָבֵד which expresses more sharply the sense of fully belonging to God.<sup>57</sup> On the

<sup>50</sup>G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953, pp. 74 ff. The thought was then taken up by Deut. Isa. and made an important pillar of his argument against the idols of the heathen (Isa. 41.22 f., 26 f.; 42.9 etc.).

<sup>51</sup>In Isa. 20.3, Isaiah too is called ‘my servant’ by Yahweh.

<sup>52</sup>II Kings 9.7; 17.13, 23; 21.10; 24.2; Jer. 7.25; 25.4; 26.5; 29.19; 35.15; 44.4; Ezek. 38.17; Amos 3.7 (probably a later addition); Zech, 1.6; Dan. 9.6, 10; Ezra 9.11.

<sup>53</sup>I Kings 22.19 ff. shows both circles of the heavenly court in a peculiar connexion. The name עָבֵד is not mentioned here.

<sup>54</sup>Noth (loc. cit. in n. 32).

<sup>55</sup>LXX II Chron. 24.6 translates Moses' title עָבֵד יְהוָה by ἀνθρώπος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

<sup>56</sup>For the late development see n. 23.

<sup>57</sup>אִישׁ can also express the idea of belonging to a collective, e.g., in the plural, the men of Kirjath-jearim (I Sam. 7.1), of Jabesh (I Sam. 11.5, 10). Such a use is inconceivable with עָבֵד, cf. p. 12, n. 21.

other hand, the older writing prophets clearly avoid<sup>58</sup> the use of עָבֵד as a description of their office. An attempt has been made to explain this by suggesting that the word עָבֵד implies 'the bondage of man's will to the will of God', whereas the prophets 'demand a free decision for obedience to the will of God'.<sup>59</sup> This explanation is not convincing. A more adequate suggestion is that the description of oneself or others as עָבֵד יהוה is rooted in the cultic style of the sanctuaries (cf. the Psalms) and of popular piety—shaped by courtly style. The older writing prophecy stands in strong opposition to this type of piety and avoids its terminology.<sup>60</sup> It is significant that the terminology in the Deuteronomic sections of Jer. and especially in Deut. Isa.,<sup>61</sup> whose close affinity with popular prophecy and the Psalms is becoming ever plainer, gains more and more ground.

(e) In the framework of the book of Job, the latter is several times named by Yahweh 'my servant' (1.8; 2.3; 42.7 f.). Within the section nourished by Wisdom literature the writer speaks freely of a 'servant of Yahweh' outside the borders of Israel. What is concretely displayed in Job's fidelity is, despite the fact that in Job's own words the name of Yahweh is avoided, the best biblical awareness of Yahweh's immovable connexion with his creation (cf. for instance, 14.13–15). Further, the active obedience of the servant of God is here vigorously stressed. Job's fear of God, which was vividly depicted in the introduction, proves itself in faithful obedience, since in spite of all the temptation of Satan he does not renounce God with a curse. Hence God acknowledges Job by graciously naming him his own servant עָבֵד as against the calumniating speech of Satan (1.8; 2.3), and the self-righteous speeches of the friends (42.7 f.).

(v) *The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.* The O.T. usage of עָבֵד יהוה reached its fulfilment in the suffering servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah.

Since in 1892 Duhm took from their context the passages

<sup>58</sup> Amos 3.7 is probably secondary; Isa. 20.3 seems to be a report at third hand, cf. O. Procksch, *Isaiah I*, 1930, 255. Isa. 37.35 comes from the Isaiah legend; thus 22.20 remains, if genuine.

<sup>59</sup> Baudissin, *Entwicklung*, 8.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. the terms 'covenant', 'election' in patriarchal theology.

<sup>61</sup> The passages in Isa. and Ezek. which have the religious use of עָבֵד seem likewise to come from the groups of pupils.

Isa. 42.1-4; 49.1-6; 50.4-9 and 52.13-53.12, and referred them to a later time as songs depicting the fate of an unknown teacher of the torah, the question of their connexion with Deutero-Isaiah has been much discussed.<sup>62</sup> Closer examination has shown how intimately they<sup>63</sup> are related to Deut. Isa., as regards diction, style, and pattern of structure.<sup>64</sup> This applies least to 52.13-53.12 where the middle portion (53.1-11a), in particular, stands out as a song of thanksgiving by the community, with characteristic style and peculiarity of diction.<sup>65</sup> Even in content it goes beyond the matter of the first songs. But it is impossible to free it from the framework of Yahweh words (52.13-15; 53.11b, 12), which for its part is inseparable from 49.7. But the latter is more strongly Deuteronomic in style, and in thought is not far removed from 50.4-9. So 52.13-53.12, the final mystery of which is not yet cleared up, appears firmly attached to the whole cycle of songs and is, like the other songs, to be interpreted in the light of Deutero-Isaiah's message.

(a) How is the figure of the שׁבָד to be explained? In the history of exposition there have been from early times two main opposing contentions. Consideration of the present text of 49.3, and of the otherwise predominant use of the שׁבָד title in Deut. Isa. (cf. p. 17 above), pointed inevitably to the collective interpretation of Israel as a whole.<sup>66</sup> In contrast with that stands the idea of an individual figure suggested by the songs.<sup>67</sup> Reflection on the religious use of the שׁבָד concept in the O.T. where, except for the unambiguous collective application in Deut. Isa., the individual application pre-

<sup>62</sup>A full history of recent exposition is given by North in the first part of his book.

<sup>63</sup>To them should probably be added 42.5-9; 49.7, 8-13. Cf. Begrich, *Studien*, 74 f., 131-51.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. Gressmann, 'Analyse'; also Köhler and Begrich, *Studien*. Mowinckel, 'Komposition', does not pay sufficient attention, in his counter argument, to the conclusions established in regard to style and genre.

<sup>65</sup>A separate origin for 52.13-53.12, has been argued even in recent times by Elliger, Volz and Sellin.

<sup>66</sup>The text was already modified in that sense in the LXX 42.1 (see pp. 40 f.). Cf. in the middle ages the Jewish exegesis by Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi; and later J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische-Gesch.*, 1894, 117-18. See Giesebricht, Budde, *Ebed Jabve-Lieder*, 34, Eissfeldt, 25, and others.

<sup>67</sup>The oldest piece of evidence is probably Isa. 61.1 ff. Cf. also W. Zimmerli, 'Zur Sprache Tritj's', in *Festschr. L. Köhler*, 1950, 69-71. LXX particularly for 52.13 ff., cf. p. 41 below. Cf. further the question of the eunuch, Acts 8.34. More recently, see n. 70.

## The Servant of God in the Old Testament

dominates (cf. pp. 18 ff.), is not itself decisive. The suggestion of an individual meaning in 49.5 f. might well commend itself to us. If the words of God here, which answer a complaint of the servant, refer to an originally more limited mission of the **עָבֵד** to Israel and to its later expansion to cover the gentiles, then there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the collective interpretation.<sup>68</sup> In the **ישָׁרָאֵל** of 49.3 we shall have to see an early, but in the text a secondary *midrash*<sup>69</sup> made in a collective sense while the original text will have to be interpreted in an individual sense. But in that case, what kind of an individual is meant? The use of the **עָבֵד** title elsewhere in the O.T. apart from its application to the great figures of early times (patriarchs and Moses), suggests two main lines of development: the Messiah-King (see p. 20) and the prophets (see p. 21). Attempts have been made to solve the **עָבֵד** riddle by means of both these types.<sup>70</sup> A closer study of the character of the servant's office, the means of its fulfilment described in 50.4 ff. (ear, tongue), and unmistakable points of contact with

<sup>68</sup>The reckless adjustment of the text by Giesebricht, 44 f., will convince as little as the tortured reinterpretation of Budde (in Kautzsch ad loc.). Again, the recent attempts at collective interpretation by Eissfeldt and H. Wheeler Robinson, 58–62, do indeed give us important information about the conception of the people as a collective personality but do not really get to grips with the text of Deut. Isa. Finally the assertion that the issue ought not to be presented as a stark alternative (e.g., A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the O.T.*, II, 1949, 113, 'Ebed Yahweh is both the Messiah and Israel and Deutero-Isaiah and his band of disciples', *inter alia*) seems to me to serve only to befog the whole problem.

<sup>69</sup>For the possibility of such interpretations cf. LXX of 42.1. J. A. Bewer has shown in 'The text-critical Value of the Hebrew MS Ken. 96 for Isaiah 49.3', in *Jewish Studies in Memory of G. A. Kohut*, 1935, 86–88; also in 'Textkritische Bemerkungen', in *Festschrift für A. Bertholet*, 1950, 67–68, that the MS Kennicott 96 in which **ישָׁרָאֵל** in 49.3 is absent cannot be adduced as evidence of sound tradition. The gloss goes back behind all the textual evidence at our disposal (cf. also M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St Mark's Monastery*, I, = *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, 1950, plate 40, line 30).

<sup>70</sup>For the kingly line the following have been thought of: Uzziah: see J. W. C. Augusti, 'Über den König Ussia nebst einer Erläuterung Is 53', in *Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte*, 3, 1795, 282–99; K. Dietze, *Ussia, der Knecht Gottes*, 1929; Hezekiah: L. Itkonen, 'Dtjs metrisch untersucht', *Annales Academiae Fennicae*, 14, 1916; Jehoiachin: E. Sellin, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde*, 1901, 284–97, also *Das Rätsel des deuterojesajanischen Buches*, 1908, 144–50; Zerubbabel: E. Sellin, *Serubbabel*, 148–92; the Messiah: Gressmann, *Messias*, 337 ff., J. Fischer, *Isaias 40–50 und die Perikopen vom Gottesknecht*, 1916, 165.

For the prophetic line the following have been thought of: Moses: E. Sellin, *Mose*, 108–13; Isaiah: C. F. Stäudlin, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der bibl. Propheten*, 1791; Jeremiah: C. J. Bunsen, *Vollst. Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde*, vol. 2, 1860, 438; Ezekiel: R. Krätzschmar, *Ezechiel*, 1900, among others. For the whole history of these types of exegesis see North.

Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's narratives of their call, seem to recommend a prophetic basis.<sup>71</sup> The features suggesting kingly action (execution of judgement, 42.1, 3f., release of captives, 42.7; 49.9 and the sharp sword, 49.2), can also be understood from a prophetic point of view.<sup>72</sup>

(b) What individual prophetic figure may have determined the character of the שִׁבְעָנִי? The supposition is very strong that in the songs something of the mission of Deutero-Isaiah has been reflected,<sup>73</sup> and there receives an interpretation which transcends the framework of his life and dares by faith to attain an ultimate insight.<sup>74</sup> (See *TWNT*, IV, 616, 30 ff.<sup>75</sup>) The striking element of objectification and concealment under the anonymous title שִׁבְעָנִי may well imply that the prophet did not wish to be misunderstood simply in subjective-biographical terms.<sup>76</sup> The figure is called שִׁבְעָנִי. As in the story of the servant in Gen. 24 (cf. p. 10 above), the omission of any proper name is meant to express the fact that the true essence of this mysterious figure lies in its belong-

<sup>71</sup>We have already referred to the high valuation of the prophets' word which illuminates history (Deut. Isa. uses for them the שִׁבְעָנִי title in 44.26 [of the amended text]) as a trait akin to that of the Deuteronomist; cf. n. 50.

<sup>72</sup>Whether the passion features may be claimed as something distinctive of kings, thus coming to Deut. Isa. from the ritual of the suffering atoning king, or had influenced the whole class of individual songs of lament, has been much discussed recently. See Dürr, Engnell, Bentzen and Gressmann, *Ursprung* (329–33), who argues on the basis of the Tammuz ritual. One wonders whether it would be easier and more likely to suppose that these timeless traits of a ritual king-liturgy should reach the O.T. from Babylonian cultic life, which Deutero-Isaiah passionately rejected, rather than from the prophetic confessions of Jeremiah (n. 75), which arose out of the trials of a specific historical mission. This is not to exclude the possibility that at individual points old cultic formulae may have exerted an influence and moulded language via Psalmody, already extant in Canaan and cultivated at the time of the kings. But such formulae can hardly have constituted the real impulse to the formation of the image of the servant in the mind of Deutero-Isaiah, with his passionate faith in historical decision.

<sup>73</sup>First impressively substantiated by Mowinckel in *Knecht*, then later rejected by himself in his 'Komposition'.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. the analogy of the kingly line, and see G. von Rad, 'Erwägungen zu den Königspsalmen', *ZAW*, 58, 1940–41, 216–22.

<sup>75</sup>This is suggested also by the parallelism with Jeremiah's confessions. They too, similarly overlapping the literary framework of Jeremiah's book, show the inner vision on which the duty of obedience rests, the inescapability of the prophet's mission, and especially the path of suffering which prophecy involved. But that which with Jeremiah remains in the darkness of mystery (20.14 ff.) with Deutero-Isaiah reaches a characteristically ultimate answer which rounds off O.T. insights.

<sup>76</sup>That the confessions of Jeremiah too show the struggle against his duty is shown by G. von Rad, 'Die Konfessionen Jeremias', *Evangelische Theologie*, 3, 1936, 265–76.

ing to another—here Yahweh.<sup>77</sup> Thus it becomes plain that the link is not with a thing but with a person (see p. 13). The reference to a servant occurs mostly in passages where the word of Yahweh makes a decisive call (42.1; 49.3, 6; 52.13; 53.11; only 49.5 in the third person). The servant has been fashioned by Yahweh (42.6; 49.5, 8) from his mother's womb (49.5; cf. v.1). He is the chosen one on whom Yahweh's favour has been focused (42.1), whom the hand of Yahweh has seized (42.1). He has been called by Yahweh (42.6; 49.1) in truth (i.e., validly, 42.6). His name has been named with all the solemnity of a cultic name-giving.<sup>78</sup> To this decisive election is added equipment for service. Yahweh endows his servant with his Spirit.<sup>79</sup> He touches and makes ready for his use those organs which are of especial importance for the fulfilment of the prophet's mission: the ear (50.4 f.), and the mouth (49.2; 50.4).<sup>80</sup>

(c) In what does the duty of this servant messenger consist? In the introductory words of 42.1–4, where Yahweh offers his servant a wider sphere of public service and which gives Yahweh's call to the prophet as something turned outwards,<sup>81</sup> there occurs three times, in an absolute sense, the word מִשְׁפָט to indicate the content of the servants' preaching (42.1, 3, 4). Our whole interpretation of the servant's task will turn on our understanding of these words. Is it here suggested that the duty of the servant is to spread abroad<sup>82</sup> the truth,<sup>83</sup> 'the only valid religion since Yahweh

<sup>77</sup>Do we not find there perfectly expressed the state which Jeremiah had differently suggested in one of his confessions? 'When I found thy words I devoured them. Thy word was a joy and it became the delight of my heart that I am called by thy name, O Lord.' 15.16.

<sup>78</sup>49.1. For הַנּוֹכֵר שָׁם see Ex. 20.24; 23.13; Josh. 23.7.

<sup>79</sup>42.1. Here there is a connexion with a saying from the old popular type of prophecy (cf. II Kings 2.9) which had fallen into the background with the great writing prophets. Cf. P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 1910, 24, 62–69. In the rendering of the saying in Isa. 61.1 (cf. n. 67) we find also the thought of the anointing of the prophet, which can likewise be attested in the older type of prophecy (cf. I Kings 19.16).

<sup>80</sup>Cf. Jer. 1.9; Isa. 6.7 and Ezek. 3.1 ff.

<sup>81</sup>A N.T. analogy is the juxtaposition of the word at the baptism addressed to Jesus himself in Mark 1.11; Luke 3.22; and the address to the bystanders in Matt. 3.17. More expressly in Matt. 17.5 (Mark 9.7, Luke 9.35).

<sup>82</sup>On מִשְׁפָט cf. further TWNT, III, 932; J. Pedersen, *Israel, its life and culture*, I-II, 1946, 348–52. Oddly enough K. Fahlgren, *„dākā nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im A.T.*, 1932, 120–38, which treats of מִשְׁפָט, does not speak of Isa. 42.1–4.

<sup>83</sup>Volz, ad loc.

### *The Servant of God*

is the only God',<sup>84</sup> 'the true law in which Yahweh's Spirit has found perfect expression'?<sup>85</sup> In that case the servant might be thought of simply in terms of a missionary whose task it was to convert men everywhere to this true and timeless insight—a work which it is difficult to conceive as practicable for a single individual, and against which the objections of those who support the collective idea are justified. Or should we not see here rather in strict historical connexion the suggestion of an instruction in judgement and right (in 42.4 the parallelism of מִשְׁפָט and תּוֹרָה) which is rooted in the accompanying divine execution of judgements in history? It cannot be denied that this second line of understanding is far nearer to what we know of prophecy in general than the first, which would make of Deutero-Isaiah a teacher of religion in quite a new style.

What then is the history with which the proclamation of מִשְׁפָט coheres, and wherein by reason of its content it is rooted? In Isa. 42.2 f. the content of this proclamation of מִשְׁפָט is indicated by means of three images, which no doubt stemmed from the sphere of law-symbolism and leave no doubt about the historical place where the proclamation is made. The pictures of the herald who, contrary to custom, does not cry aloud, of the bruised reed which symbolizes the death sentence, and which contrary to expectation does not break, and of the smoking flax never quite extinguished, are designed to express the surprising act of grace by which Yahweh establishes justice.<sup>86</sup> Isa. 42.7 speaks more clearly of the release of captives, and in 49.5 f. it is quite openly stated that, in concrete terms, it is a question of the restoration of the preserved of Israel, i.e., of the exiles, and of the gathering together of the people (v. 5 should read לֹא יַשְׂרָאֵל לוֹ יַעֲשֶׂה). The passage 49.8 ff. describes this restoration, in harmony with the joyful tones of Deutero-Isaiah's message elsewhere, as a return journey through a now transformed desert blessed with water, and as a new taking possession of the devastated promised land. At the same time it

<sup>84</sup>Budde in Kautzsch, ad. loc.

<sup>85</sup>W. Hertzberg, 'Die Entwicklung des Begriffes מִשְׁפָט im A.T.' *ZAW*, 41, 1923, 41, n. 1.

<sup>86</sup>The images of the sword and the arrow (49.2) are meant to express the idea that the Word of God in the mouth of the prophet has the power of penetration (cf. Jer. 23.29). They ought not in sentimental fashion to be set over against 42.2 f. (against Volz, ad loc.).

becomes clear that in all that, not only is there intended an external historical restitution but an establishment of justice which will transform Israel both outwardly and inwardly. The eyes of the blind shall be opened (42.7; cf. the blind people 43.8); darkness will be pierced with light (49.9); Israel will again find her God and will recognize his faithfulness (hence the call to return 44.22). Thus Yahweh marvellously establishes his justice for a people which had dejectedly complained of the loss of its right (40.27).

But that does not exhaust this process. Isa. 49.5 f. reports a mighty expansion of the mission of the servant which will be made clear to him just when he despairs of the success of his efforts.<sup>87</sup> Already in 42.1 f. it is stressed that the judgement, מִשְׁפָט, though obviously concerning Israel in the first instance, shall be proclaimed to all peoples even to the farthest isles.<sup>88</sup> In 49.5 f. what is there suggested incidentally becomes a full and direct statement: the servant will be a light for the whole earth.<sup>89</sup> His activity which takes place against the background of Yahweh's vindication of Israel<sup>90</sup> soon to be historically manifested, destroys

<sup>87</sup>In a striking parallel (Jer. 12.1-6) the downcast prophet is 'comforted' by Yahweh's reference to an increased burden.

<sup>88</sup>The parallel in Jeremiah's call, who is from the beginning appointed as a prophet to the nations (1.5, 10), although at first his activity is limited to Judah, must not be overlooked at this point.

<sup>89</sup>Cf. also in 42.6 אֹרֶגֶזֶם, which is, however, not an assured reading (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 54). If the associated בְּרִית עַם which occurs again alone in 49.8 is to be understood as a synonymous phrase, then the scope of the servant's mission is here widened as is also the covenant category stemming from Israel's history; he becomes a בְּרִית for the peoples. In this there is in view the thought of the covenant as a gift of grace; cf. Begrich, 'Berith', *ZAW*, 60, 1944, 1-11 and *TWNT*, I, 34, n. 73. The idea of the covenant can hardly be interpreted here in a narrow juristic way. It includes the two points: first, the fact that Yahweh's salvation extends to the ends of the earth (49.6); and second, that consequently every knee should bow and every tongue confess Yahweh's power (45.23 f.).

<sup>90</sup>At this point should be mentioned the declaration about Cyrus. This proclamation is in a certain sense a further development of the announcement in Deuteronomic-Jeremianic circles concerning the royal servant Nebuchadnezzar. The only difference is that in Deut. Isa. the title עָבֵד is replaced by the clearly military-political title מֶשֶׁיחַ. From this point of view it is unlikely that the עָבֵד should be understood in a kingly-messianic sense. The substitution theories, e.g., of Hempel, which see in the proclamation a substitute for the disappointed expectation centred in Cyrus, rest at the decisive point—the supposed experience of disillusionment—on very uncertain ground. But no more may the Cyrus expectation, as Begrich, *Studien*, 144 f., wishes, be interpreted as the scanty remnant of a disappointed eschatological hope. It represents—not as a logical necessity but for a daring faith in Yahweh—the true historical manifestation of the saving nearness of Yahweh. In Isa. and Jer. too, such interpretations of historical phenomena can be recognized.

the still apparently triumphant world of idols.<sup>91</sup> It glorifies the sole honour of Yahweh and thus becomes the light and salvation of the whole world.<sup>92</sup>

(d) The passages 49.7; 50.4–9; and 52.13–53.12 make it clear that the servant passed through a vale of suffering. The lot of Jeremiah repeats itself in the experience of the servant of Yahweh. But while as a result of his confessions and the tale of woe, written no doubt by Baruch, the sufferings of Jeremiah are brought into the full light of biographical openness, Deutero-Isaiah reports with a noticeable objectivity and aloofness. In what does the suffering of the servant consist? Was he persecuted by his own people? The visible opposition of the exiles (45.9 f.) to the announcement that Cyrus had been sent by Yahweh as the anointed and saviour of Israel, might seem to lend colour to

<sup>91</sup>The speeches of rebuke and judgement against the idols 41.1–5, 21–29; 43.8–13; 44.4–6 etc., are to be understood against the background of Yahweh's imminent fulfilment of the right in history. They are not meant to express 'monotheistic insights'—static, timeless and divorced from history—but to glorify triumphantly the truth which is soon to be actualized historically in judgements which will thus assume eschatological dimensions. The speech against the escaped of the nations (45.20) shows that the healing of the nations will be realized by a judgement shattering not only the idols but also their worshippers; cf. Begrich, *Studien* especially ch. 3 'Das Verhältnis Dtjs's zur religiösen Überlieferung'.

<sup>92</sup>Begrich, *Studien*, supp. I, 161–66, would like to translate **הָזִיא מִשְׁפַּט** 42.1 as 'make known the judgement'. Thus he would see in the servant the one who proclaims publicly Yahweh's gracious judgements on Israel, and he inquires further whether we should not recognize in 42.1–4 the book of the duties of the above mentioned (p. 11) **עֶבֶד הַמֶּלֶךְ עֶבֶד**. The latter would thus be a herald whose office it would be to make known the righteous judgements of the king through the symbolism which is transparent in 42.2 f. Thus Begrich claims that the choice of the title **עֶבֶד יהוה** is to be understood by analogy with this office. Against this last hypothesis it must be pointed out that Begrich clearly does not take sufficiently into account to what an extent Deut. Isa. is here dependent on older linguistic usage in the description of the prophets, and the fact that he is in no way coining new phrases. Also Begrich's suggested translation of **הָזִיא מִשְׁפַּט** can hardly be justified. If it might be considered for the **הָזִיא מִשְׁפַּט** of 42.1 it is utterly impossible for the synonymous **שִׁים מִשְׁפַּט** of 42.4; and above all for the parallelism of **מִשְׁפַּט** and **תֹּרֶה**. Here it must be a question of the establishment of a universal judgement overlapping the individual case (cf. the **מִשְׁפַּט הַמֶּלֶךְ** of I Sam. 8, or the formula in II Kings 17.27 **הָרָה אֲהָמִשְׁפַּט אֲכֹחֵי תְּאֵצֶן** akin to 42.4). But the views of Begrich may well be correct in so far as this execution of justice stands in the closest relation to the gracious judgements of Yahweh, taking concrete shape in the history of Israel, which it is the office of the servant as messenger of joy to announce, and that it finds in those disclosures its guarantee, and that in consequence the proclamation of salvation to the peoples radiates from this revelation through history to which Israel, by its experience of grace, remains the true witness (43.10; 44.8).

such a supposition. Did the Babylonian power pit itself against the proclaimer of the power of Yahweh? The formula, 'servant of rulers', coined in antithesis to the 'servant of Yahweh' (49.7), and the allusion (49.7; 52.15) to the forthcoming astonishment of kings might be regarded as pointing in that direction. Did the servant fall sick?<sup>93</sup> The songs give us no definite information. As in the psalms of lament, multiple competing images give us oblique indication. Also the question whether 53.8–10 speaks of the death of the servant,<sup>94</sup> or whether it suggests only the imminent and ineluctable but not yet fulfilled necessity of his dying,<sup>95</sup> is wrapped in an obscurity which we cannot with certainty pierce. With this is involved the further point that 52.13–53.12, after echoing clearly traits from the earlier songs, unmistakably abandons the realm of the biographical, on the basis of which we thought we could understand what the servant's office was, and gives a picture of the true servant of Yahweh which far transcends the personal experience of the prophet. Thus it is not by chance or by ineptitude that Isa. 53 has again and again been understood as alluding to the figure of the one that is to come.<sup>96</sup>

Thus it is at this point that the account of the servant diverges from the account of Jeremiah given in his confessions, and goes beyond them to express in a twofold way a final word about the office of and promise to the true יהוה עבד. Jeremiah's confessions ended on a note of unrelieved darkness,<sup>97</sup> but the servant of Yahweh comes to rest in the recognition of the deep meaning in his pain. His suffering is vicarious.<sup>98</sup> In the context of this deepest

<sup>93</sup>Duhm, ad loc., explains the פָּגָע of 53.4 as referring to the leper.

<sup>94</sup>See Elliger; Sellin, 'Lösung'. In this case the text must come from a later hand.

<sup>95</sup>Begrich, *Studien*.

<sup>96</sup>H. W. Wolff, 36, formulates the idea of a prefiguration of the coming one to express the prophet's sense of transcendence over his own specific office. G. von Rad ("Gerechtigkeit" und "Leben" in den Ps." in *Festschr. A. Bertholet*, 1950, 424 f.) has pointed out that in the speech of the psalmist about the 'righteous', we meet with such images, conceived in the ultimate daring of faith, to transcend the empirical. He speaks of the prototype of the just (קִדְשָׁן). On the analogy of Ps. 2 (n. 74) we might refer to the royal messianic line.

<sup>97</sup>In the cursing of his own birth the tormented messenger of God cries out in the final word of his confessions (20.14 ff.). The sole ray of light which illuminates his darkness, lies in the prophet's surmise that he does not bear his pain alone but that it is a sharing of the pain of Yahweh. This is directly asserted in the word to Baruch (45.4 f.) and may be indirectly recognized in 12.7 ff.

<sup>98</sup>Stamm: 68–75: vicarious suffering. The use of the common sacrificial idea פָּשָׁת in 53.10, and the use of the image of the slaughtered animal (suggested of course by

insight which—and here the reserve of the language reaches its climax—is uttered not by the servant himself, but by a fellowship of believers gripped by this event,<sup>99</sup> the servant's own reaction to his sorrows, as compared with that of Jeremiah, is utterly different. Here is the fulfilment of the **עָבֹד יְהוָה עַבֹּד** attitude: the bears in obedience and surrender what Yahweh ordains for him (53.6, 10). In words which are reminiscent of Ezekiel he confesses his unresisting obedience.<sup>100</sup> The image which Jeremiah uses in his confessions of the sheep led to the slaughter, and which in Jer. 11.19 is meant to express the unsuspecting innocence of the prophet encircled by threats,<sup>101</sup> is now deepened to express the servant's passive readiness to bear his pain (Isa. 53.7).

(e) What is the source of such a surrender? Is it simply the result of insight into the hidden meaning of a personal experience of sorrow? Or is it merely blind obedience? Here is the second point at which Deutero-Isaiah goes beyond Jeremiah; for he reaches the triumphant recognition that Yahweh will vindicate his servant beyond death and the grave. Alongside the confession of utter submission to the Lord, which is proper to the consciousness of the O.T. עָבֵד, stands the liberating insight of faith in the ultimate fidelity of Yahweh to the servant whom he has called. Or to express it by means of the two concepts which are implied in the servant's profession of trust (49.4): the servant knows that he will receive from Yahweh his right (טְמִימָה) and his reward (פָּעַלָּה). Right is the key-word which governs 50.7 ff. In face of the bitter humiliations which he has known, the servant here confesses his firm trust in Yahweh: 'The Lord Yahweh will help

Jeremiah) imply perhaps that the thought of sacrifice is not far away. Yet here too everything is again left in great uncertainty. One may wonder whether, in view of the obvious contacts between Deut. Isa. and Deuteronomic material, there may not be a reference to Moses, that great servant of Yahweh, who was more than a prophet (Bentzen, 64-67, following H. S. Nyberg). Deut. 3.26 reports of him, after he had prayed to be permitted to enter the land of Canaan: 'But Yahweh was angry with me for your sakes.' Nothing is said here of any guilt incurred by Moses which Num. 20.12 seems to imply. Moses bears the anger of Yahweh against his people. There is, however, nothing about a *voluntary* action. On Ex. 32.30 see Stamm, 71.

<sup>90</sup> 53.1-11a is set in the context of two passages which illuminate the whole: 52.13-15; 53.11b-12. The second passage takes up the theme of substitution in connexion with 53.1-11a.

<sup>100</sup> 50.5. Is there a side-glance here at Jeremiah who rebelled in his prophetic suffering (15.19)? See Ezek 2.8, etc., for מִרְאָה in connexion with the prophet's call.

<sup>101</sup>In Jer. 12.3 it is applied as a bitter word of revenge against enemies (omitted in the LXX).

me; therefore shall I not be confounded; therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed.' Then the speech breaks out into an apostrophe, and an appeal such as is made by an accused person in a court of law<sup>102</sup>—a favourite mode of expression with Deutero-Isaiah: 'He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? Let us stand together; who is mine adversary? Let him come near to me. Behold they shall wax old as a garment; the moth shall eat them up.'<sup>103</sup> As the Lord's servant Job, in the face of all the frustrations of the present, knows that at last Yahweh will manifest his righteousness, so here the servant of the Lord. In 52.13–53.12, on the other hand, it reaches a climax in the thought of Yahweh's reward to his servant. Even greater emphasis, externally, is laid on this whole circle of ideas by the fact that this ultimate goal is expressed not merely in terms of the subjective faith of the servant, but in the words of Yahweh himself, who after the community's words of 53. 1–10a himself speaks and gives his concluding pledge to his servant. By the image of the dividing of the conquered spoil<sup>104</sup> is expressed the vindication which Yahweh will procure for his servant beyond death and the grave (53.12).<sup>105</sup> If in Isa. 53 we seek a didactically formulated expression of what is implied in salvation from death,<sup>106</sup> which is clearly the theme here, we shall be disappointed. There is no such expression. What is said is concealed beneath the image. On the other hand, the promise that Yahweh himself will uphold his servant against death and the grave—and thus show that the servant belongs inseparably to him—is unmistakably ratified.

(f) But finally, in all this is it a question of a mere private happening between the servant and his Lord? It is very striking how in Yahweh's speech introducing his final words (52.13 ff.) there is an emphasis on the effect which the encounter between Yahweh and his servant produces on a wider public. Kings and the great

<sup>102</sup>Begrich, *Studien*, 19–42, 48–49.

<sup>103</sup>Isa. 51.8. The same image of Yahweh's eschatological vindication of right against his enemies.

<sup>104</sup>40.10 f. seems also to connect war booty and reward. Again 9.3 illustrates the joy of the eschatological day of salvation by picturing the joy of dividing the spoil.

<sup>105</sup>In 1ob the astonished onlookers were already speaking of the granting of posterity to him who was obviously given over to death.

<sup>106</sup>For this whole circle of problems cf. Ch. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des A.T.*, 1947.

*The Servant of God*

ones of the earth will be astonished at it (52.14 f.). Isa. 49.7 may suggest what Yahweh intends by this public character of the happening. 'Kings shall see and arise, princes shall prostrate themselves—because of Yahweh's fidelity and his choice of thee.' Thus, finally, this vindication and recompense of the servant shall redound to the honour of Yahweh and to the fuller recognition of his fidelity by the whole world. In that the work of the servant is consummated.

## II

## TRANSLATIONS IN THE LXX

I. THE **עַבְדָּן** TRANSLATIONS IN THE LXX

**עַבְדָּן** occurs 807 times in the M.T.<sup>107</sup> The following equivalents<sup>108</sup> are to be found in the LXX: *παῖς* (*παιδίον*, *παιδάριον*) 340 times; *δοῦλος*, (*δουλεία*,<sup>109</sup> *δουλεύων*) 327 times; *οἰκέτης* (*οἶκος*) 63 times; *θεράπων* (*θεραπεία*, *θεραπεύων*) 46 times; *νιός* once; *ὑπηρέτης* once. Further there are 56 places where there is a misunderstanding or a free translation. The rendering by these various Greek equivalents does not follow the same principles in all the O.T. books, but at different points discloses different principles—a fact which clearly implies a plurality of translators. Since the 272 passages where **עַבְדָּן** appears in relation to Yahweh are not distinguished by any special type of translation, we must survey the translations of all the **עַבְדָּן** passages together.

(a) A first important layer of translation is to be found in the books Gen. to Josh. Not that these books show uniformity in the translations they offer. It is strikingly clear even that in Gen. a different hand must have been at work from that which was at work in Ex.<sup>110</sup> In Gen. the *παῖς* title is the rule. Of 88 **עַבְדָּן** texts, 79 are translated by *παῖς*, and *οἰκέτης* occurs five times. In Ex., on the other hand, *θεράπων* prevails. Of 43 **עַבְדָּן** texts, 23 are translated by *θεράπων*; only 8 by *παῖς* and 6 by *οἰκέτης*. The Egyptian courtiers called *παιδεῖς* in Gen. are here denominated

<sup>107</sup> 800 times in Heb., 7 times in Aram. text.

<sup>108</sup> Text of Rahlfs. In Judg. text B, in Dan. the LXX, and not the Theodotion text of the great manuscripts are used for the statistics. See on Isa. Ziegler, 'Isaias'.

<sup>109</sup> The numerous *δουλεία*-passages to be found in Swete are throughout considered by Rahlfs as itacism and written in the form *δουλεία*.

<sup>110</sup> The conclusion by F. Baumgärtel, J. Herrmann and F. Baumgärtel: *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta*, 1923, 55, that Gen., as contrasted with the rest of the Pentateuch, occupies a special position, is thus thoroughly confirmed by an examination of the translation of **עַבְדָּן**.

θεράποντες.<sup>111</sup> In the subsequent Hexateuch writings the renderings, which in Gen. and Ex. are so characteristically distributed, are mixed: Lev. παῖς 3 times; οἰκέτης 4 times; Num. θεράπων 4 times; παῖς 5 times; οἰκέτης once; Deut. παῖς 9 times; οἰκέτης 8 times; θεράπων 4 times; only Josh. shows again a predominance of παῖς 13 times, though of course θεράπων (3 times) and οἰκέτης (3 times) are not absent. What, however, in spite of these differences characterizes the books of the Hexateuch and unmistakably differentiates it from the following five narrative books is the almost complete absence of δοῦλος. Of the 88 texts of Gen. and the 11 of Num., not a single one is translated by δοῦλος; of the 15 δοῦλος examples in the remaining 4 books of the Hexateuch, 10 can be discounted as referring to Egypt, the house of bondage (οἶκος δουλείας). In Lev. 25.44 the foreign slave is denoted by δοῦλος. Ex. 21.7 (misunderstood in the LXX) seems also to point in this direction. Deut. 32.36 belongs to the Song of Moses, which also in v. 43, the second occurrence of בָּבֶל in the Heb. text of the Song of Moses, shows a peculiarity in the Greek translation. Josh. 24.29 (LXX. v. 30) seems to be determined by the parallel Judg. 2.8. There remains Josh. 9.23, where in the curse on the Gibeonites δοῦλος occurs. Hence it is clear that δοῦλος has been used quite rarely only in connexion with the special hardships of slavery. Throughout the whole slavery law (Ex. 21.7 excepted) we have παῖς (Ex. 21.2, 5, 20, 32) and οἰκέτης (Ex. 21.26 f.) and also in formulae of submission (Josh. 9.8 f., 11). As regards the courtly style of self-reference we find παῖς in Gen. 18.3, 5, and elsewhere, and οἰκέτης in Ex. 5.16 in the same verse with παῖς. Hence the usage passes over into humble discourse in the presence of Yahweh. Here, too, Jacob can call himself παῖς (Gen. 32.10) or Moses (Ex. 4.10) θεράπων of God. Also where the title is used independently, Moses the servant of Yahweh, is described as θεράπων (Ex. 14.31; Num. 12.7), the patriarchs as οἰκέται (Ex. 32.13) and Caleb (Num. 14.24) like Moses (Josh. 1.13; 12.6, and elsewhere) as παῖς κυρίου. Here again, what is

<sup>111</sup>In Gen. only in 45.16 is the court of Pharaoh פַּרְעֹה וְעֶבֶד־יְהִי translated Φαραώ καὶ ἡ θεραπεία αὐτοῦ. And in 50.17 in humble self-reference the title θεράπων is used in connexion with the name of the God of the fathers: τῶν θεραπόντων τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ πατρός σου.

really striking is the complete avoidance of the name δοῦλος which later in Judg. to IV *Bασ.* just as exclusively governs religious terminology.

The Song of Moses still requires a brief notice. It is remarkable in that v. 36 is the only text in the Hexateuch where the religious δοῦλος idea is met with. But on the other hand v. 43 is the only text where **עָבֵד** is translated νίος. Thus, with unusual emphasis both aspects of the **עָבֵד** are underlined. Has Deut. 32 the same translation history as the rest of the Hexateuch?

(b) Alongside the Hexateuchal group of writings which can be characterized only negatively stands the group Judg. to IV *Bασ.*, which can plainly be described by positive features. Here only the two words παῖς and δοῦλος are used to translate **עָבֵד**. And, indeed, here is to be noted the neat distinction by which παῖς is used to denote only the category of the free servants of the king who place themselves at his disposal by their own decision (soldiers, ministers, and officials, cf. p. 11). On the other hand, δοῦλος expresses true essential slavery.<sup>112</sup> It denotes, therefore, him who is compelled to be a serf even were he a king (II *Bασ.* 10.19). Naturally, this word is employed in the contemptuous speech of a Saul (I *Bασ.* 22.8) or even of a Nabal against David (I *Bασ.* 25.10) even where it refers to him who objectively considered would be in the position of a παῖς. These considerations lead us to conclude that in the whole field of courtly speech, whether one is speaking of himself or another,<sup>113</sup> the δοῦλος title is used. If the **עָבֵד הַלְּמָד** of IV *Bασ.* 22.12 is described as δοῦλος τοῦ βασιλέως then it must mean that his office is misunderstood in the sense of a menial service. As a rule the distinction is so carefully maintained throughout the whole five books that where there is an apparent deviation the question must seriously be raised whether the translator has not desired to express a slight nuance not contained in the Heb. text (II *Bασ.* 12.18 f.; 15.34; doubtfully 21.22). In accordance with what has already been said, we see that in humble

<sup>112</sup>The slaves of Ziba (II *Bασ.* 9.10, 12; 19.17) who was himself a παῖς of the house of Saul 9.2; the Egyptian slave of an Amalekite (I *Bασ.* 30.13).

<sup>113</sup>Ahimelech of the servants of Saul, I *Bασ.* 22.14, called in an objective narrative παῖδες, 6 f., or Ziba in courtly self-description, represented as παῖς in the same verse, II *Bασ.* 9.2.

self-description in prayer to God the petitioner constantly refers to himself as δοῦλος. The fact that for the great individual figures of Israelite history, for Moses and Joshua as well as for the figures of the kingly line,<sup>114</sup> the δοῦλος title is used without exception betrays plainly that the translator wished to view even these great men of history not after the pattern of the free kingly ministry, but after that of the humble slave.

(c) The two groups of writings, Gen. to Josh.<sup>115</sup> and Judg. to IV Bar. show us two phases in the translation history of the LXX. The second of these is plainly recognizable by the determination to achieve a more precise apprehension of the facts in the translation of נָבָע. This is expressed in the careful distinction between παῖς and δοῦλος. The first phase is more difficult to explain. It has been suggested that the rule of translation here is based on the fact that the ambiguous παῖς<sup>116</sup> best corresponds to the ambiguous נָבָע. This purely linguistic explanation may perhaps illuminate the facts so far as Gen. is concerned. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that the ambiguity of the two terms lies in different directions, and that their equivalence is in no sense material and substantial. But whence comes the use of θεράπων in Ex.? And why the unmistakable avoidance of the harsh δοῦλος when the promiscuous use of παῖς, οἰκέτης and θεράπων becomes the rule (Ex.—Josh.)? The fact that even in the translation of the religious נָבָע phrase δοῦλος is avoided, and only παῖς, οἰκέτης and θεράπων,<sup>117</sup> which is fairly far removed from the O.T. attitude, are used, may well indicate that the translation of the Hexateuch in Hellenistic Judaism shows us a first phase of biblical translation which betrays the uninhibited influence of the Greek feeling for the nearness of God and

<sup>114</sup>The verse III Bar. 8.59 LXX (B), in which, as against M. T., Israel itself seems to be understood by the servant, may be considered as an error through homoioteleuton, cf. Rahlf.

<sup>115</sup>It may be considered established that Josh. was among the writings first translated and that the Hexateuch, which is beginning to be very problematical as a literary quantity for O.T. criticism (M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, I, 1943, 253), is to be thought of for the translation period as a continuous whole.

<sup>116</sup>P. Katz (*Philo's Bible*, 1950, 6, n. 1 and Appendix I, 141–6), has shown in regard to the translation of מִסְפֵּר, for example, that such rules of translation are recognizable. As regards the use of παῖς and δοῦλος in Philo, *ibid.* 83–87.

<sup>117</sup>TWNT, III, 132, 12 ff. ‘The word θεράπεια does not of itself fit into the language of the O.T. religion of revelation, but into that of heathendom (cf. Acts 17.25).’

man.<sup>118</sup> The translation of the section Judg.—IV Βασ. which took place somewhat later shows the growing awareness of the specific O.T. consciousness of the distance between God and man, and the fact that man belongs to God. In the exclusive use of the harsher δοῦλος idea in religious speech the scandal of the austere sovereignty of God is carried over into the image of man in the Greek Bible.<sup>119</sup>

(d) Broadly speaking, the later biblical books no longer give the clear picture presented by the two big groups of writings in the earlier part of the LXX. The patterns distinguished above begin to get confused. A general survey shows that the translation of שׁבֵּד by θεράπων, the most daring and farthest from the Hebrew, recedes altogether. Apart from the mention in Isa. 54.17,<sup>120</sup> this translation now appears only in Job where again it is predominant.<sup>121</sup> The Pss. as a whole adopt δοῦλος, which occurs fifty-three times as opposed to παῖς, three times.<sup>122</sup> In Ezekiel all five religious references to עָבֹד are translated δοῦλος (Jacob, David, and the prophets) as also are the five in the Dodekapropheton (Moses, David, the prophets) and the two in Ezra (the prophets and the Jerusalem community).<sup>123</sup> On the other hand, there is Isaiah. In Proto-Isa. all three, in Deut. Isa. fourteen of the twenty religious עָבֹד texts are translated by παῖς. In Isa.: Isaiah himself, Eliakim and David; in Deut. Isa.: Israel the prophetic servant.<sup>124</sup> Dan. is to be linked with it where all twelve references (seven of which are religious) are

<sup>118</sup>Also παῖς and οἰκέτης express a stronger familiar relationship of the servant than δοῦλος.

<sup>119</sup>The later variants even in the Hexateuch put δοῦλος. Cf. for example Codex Ambrosianus on Josh. 1.1, 15; Alexandrinus on 14.7.

<sup>120</sup>In the form θεραπεύοντες (κύριον) which may point to a verbal understanding of עָבֹד יהוה.

<sup>121</sup>Nine out of the total twelve עָבֹד instances are translated by θεράπων, five of which give the predication of Job as servant of God. Only 1.8 translates by παῖς in the religious sense. LXX (A) assimilates here too while A together with LXX (V) in 42.8 replaces the first of the three instances of θεράπων by παῖς.

<sup>122</sup>Ψ 85.16 in humble self-description in prayer; 112.1 in the description of the community gathered for worship; 17.1 in the prelude of David to a psalm.

<sup>123</sup>At both points in the transcription in I Εσδρ., the δοῦλος is replaced by παῖς. Cf. II Εσδρ. (Ezra) 5.11; 9, 11 with I Εσδρ. 6.13; 8.82.

<sup>124</sup>It is quite striking that in the translation of Trit. Isa. there is a deviation into the use of δοῦλος pure and simple. We have established above (pp. 16f.) that in Isa. 56–66

translated by *παῖς*.<sup>125</sup> In Jer. the confusion of expressions is especially striking. While the formula 'my servants the prophets' in the first half of the book (7.25; 25. 4) is translated by δοῦλος, *παῖς* occurs later 26.5 (*Iερ.* 33.5); 35.15 (42.15); 44.4 (51.4). In 46.27 (26.27) Jacob is called δοῦλος and then, just beside this, in v. 28, *παῖς*. That there is a special problem behind the relation of the LXX to Jer.<sup>126</sup> is suggested by the frequent omission of a word corresponding to בָּבֶן in the older MSS. The later ones are accustomed to add δοῦλος. The confusion of patterns reaches its climax in Neh. and Chron., where it is no longer possible to see any principle behind the alternation of *παῖς* and δοῦλος.<sup>127</sup> In Neh. 1.7 f. Moses is called *παῖς* (*II Εσδρ.* 11.7); in 9.14 δοῦλος (*II Εσδρ.* 19.14) of God. In Nehemiah's humble self-description before God we find in 1.11 (*II Εσδρ.* 11.11) *παῖς* and δοῦλος in the same verse. The feeling for the specific content of the terms seems here to have completely vanished. The translation of בָּבֶן יְהוָה by ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ in *II Chron.* 24.6 has been mentioned in n. 55.

## 2. THE TRANSLATION OF SERVANT OF GOD PASSAGES IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH

The phraseology of Isa. 42.1 Ιακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ιεραχὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου shows that the LXX understands the introductory

---

the separation of the pious obedient to God from the impious godless was sharply expressed. Does this explain the fact that in the Greek translation, against three examples of δοῦλος (56.6; 63.17; 65.9) we find the form δούλευων six times (65.8, 13–15)? This form brings out more the active obedience of the servant. Only once is בָּבֶן translated by σεβόμενος (66.14; φοβούμενος Origen and Lucian).

<sup>125</sup> Theodotion translates six times by δοῦλος (each time an בָּבֶן-religious use); only in 3.28 (*Δαν.* 3.95) is *παῖς* maintained in religious use.

<sup>126</sup> P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jer.*² (Komm. zum A.T., X, 1928, L); W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (Handbuch zum A.T., II, 12, 1947, XIX f.).

<sup>127</sup> A comparison with the parallel texts in I–IV Βασ. enables us to recognize as a general tendency a strong penetration of *παῖς* texts. The clearly distinguishable differentiation of *παῖς* and δοῦλος in Judg. to IV Βασ. is in the process completely obscured, without suggesting any conscious plan. Cf. for example Nathan's discourse of promises in II Sam. 7 with I Chron. 17. In seven of the ten comparable texts *παῖς* has replaced the δοῦλος which occurs in II Sam. alone. So then in Yahweh's discourse of David we find jumbled up together *παῖδάς μου* (17.4) and τῷ δούλῳ μου (17.7) or in the humble self-description before God, τοῦ παιδός σου 17.25 alongside of τὸν δοῦλόν σου 17.26. Or in I Chron. 18.6 f. where the parallel II Sam. 8.6 f. showed a fine differentiation of *παῖς* and δοῦλος, *παῖς* is uniformly used.

words of the servant songs in the narrower sense to refer to Israel (see n.66). The destruction of the threefold parallelism evident in the Heb. text up to v. 4 as a result of the addition of the proper names speaks against the originality of the LXX text. The latter, however, is not only important because it unmistakably shows in what sense it was interpreted and hence is an early witness to the collective interpretation, but also because it shows the secondary penetration into the text of interpretative expansions. In 49.3 too this type of penetration seems at least possible (n.69). In this sense then we must take the LXX interpretation of the passages 42.1–4 (similarly 5–9) and 49.1–6 (with the connecting 7,8–13). The translation of 50.4–9 gives no plain indication of the interpretation of the translator.

On the other hand, 52.13–53.12 of the LXX might well be taken to refer to an individual figure.<sup>128</sup> The striking rendering of פָּנִים (53.2) by παιδίον, familiar from the messianic statement of 9.6 (cf. the correctly rendered δέκα likewise reminiscent of the messianic text 11.1), raises the question whether the LXX version does not imply a messianic significance. Ἀνέτειλε<sup>129</sup> which can be reconstructed in 53.2 may point in the same direction.<sup>130</sup> If so, the Greek translator must have seen in Isa. 52.13–53.12 the description of a messianic figure whose coming he awaits. This last idea is confirmed by the translation of 52.14f. as a future,<sup>131</sup> which is a clear deviation from the Heb. text. The contemptuous aversion of the many from the servant (v. 14) as also the amazed surrender of peoples and kings (v. 15) is an event which is to take place only in the future. The perfect tenses used in the description of the servant's passion (53.1 ff.)—where in deviation from the Heb. text several present tenses are interpolated<sup>132</sup>—will then have to be understood as prophetic perfects. Further, we shall ask whether the repeated solemn key-word δέξα, 52.13, 14b, 14c; 53.2, which has no full equivalent in the Heb. text, does not carry the decisive imprint of

<sup>128</sup>Cf. Euler, 85–91.

<sup>129</sup>ἀνηγγείλαμεν which appears in the versions is no doubt to be called, with Ziegler 'Isaias' ad loc. and p. 99, a textual corruption; v. 2 is to be read ἀνέτειλε μὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον. For an attempt at interpretation see Euler, 22–23.

<sup>130</sup>ἀνατολή as a translation of the messianic פָּנִים. See TWNT, I, 354 f.

<sup>131</sup>ὅν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται . . . οὕτως ἀδοξήσει . . . οὕτως θαυμάσονται . . .

<sup>132</sup>V.2 οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος; v. 4 φέρει . . . ὅδυνάται; v. 8 ἀλέται.

interpretation.<sup>133</sup> Here a figure is mentioned which by its childlike nearness to God possesses a secret δόξα. Of course in the sight of men the παις appears as a humbled and dishonoured person. Judged by human standards he has no glory.<sup>134</sup> But by a word of God<sup>135</sup> the παις becomes aware of his secret glory—nay, more than aware. Through his humiliation and death, consequent upon the ignorance of mankind, God leads him to exaltation and glorification.<sup>136</sup> In this way insight is granted to a number of men that they may apprehend the glory of the παις and the meaning of his passion. In 53.1 ff. they express their new recognition. Of course against too strong an emphasis on the thought of δόξα it may be objected that the phrasing of 52.13 ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται is a common mode of expression which is to be found also in 10.15; 33.10 and which therefore must not be over-estimated. The echoing of a word which has once been made resonant for the purpose of translating similar statements is a stylistic feature characteristic of 53.<sup>137</sup> Hence the δόξα phrase ought not perhaps to be singled out as the special interpretative element of the LXX translation. It is plain, however, that the LXX, too, thinks of a passion of the παις which leads him to death.<sup>138</sup> The exaltation following upon this death, the description of which is indebted to the store of images in the Heb. text,<sup>139</sup> goes, however, beyond the latter in suggesting that judgement is passed on the godless in retribution for their murder of the παις.<sup>140</sup> As distinct from the interpretation of the *Targums* which gives us the thought of judgement here too,<sup>141</sup> judgement according to the LXX is executed not by the παις but by God himself.

<sup>133</sup>Cf. Euler, 101-7.

<sup>134</sup>52.14b: οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἰδός σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

<sup>135</sup>The whole of 52.14 has been shaped by the LXX as a word of God to the servant.

<sup>136</sup>52.13 συνήσει . . . ὑψωθήσεται . . . δοξασθήσεται.

<sup>137</sup>Also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 24-25.

<sup>138</sup>53.8b: ὅτι αἱρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἥχθη εἰς θάνατον.

<sup>139</sup>The φῶς of 53.11 has now been confirmed by the Heb. text, see *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (op. cit. in n. 69), plate 44, line 19.

<sup>140</sup>53.9: καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηρούς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.

<sup>141</sup>See Hegermann, 86 f.

## III

Παῖς Θεοῦ IN LATE JUDAISM IN THE PERIOD AFTER  
THE LXX<sup>142</sup>

Παῖς (τοῦ) Θεοῦ occurs only seldom in late Jewish literature after 100 B.C., namely in Wisd. 2.13; 9.4; 12.7, 20; 19.6; Bar. 1.20; 2.20, 24, 28; 3.36; *Ps. Sol.* 12.6; 17.21; I Esd. 6.13, 27; 8.82; in Philo<sup>143</sup> and Josephus<sup>144</sup> only once (Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 147; Josephus, *Ant.* 10.215); finally in the later Greek translations of the O.T. (Isa. 42.1 Θ v.l., cf. p. 52; Jer. 30.10 Θ; Δαν. 3.95 Θ; Deut. 34.5 Ἀλλ.).

I. THE TWOFOLD MEANING OF Παῖς Θεοῦ

In most cases it is quite clear from the context and linguistic usage whether the meaning 'child of God' or 'servant of God' is intended. II Mac. 7.34 (see below) and Bar. 3.36 (cf. p. 45 below) are disputed passages.

(i) Παῖς Θεοῦ = 'child of God'. The plural παῖδες Θεοῦ, meaning 'children of God' occurs in four passages in Wisd. as a description of the people of Israel (12.7, 20; 19.6) or of the pious (9.4).<sup>145</sup> It has the same meaning in the one place where it occurs in Philo (*Conf. Ling.* 147).<sup>146</sup> Again in II Mac. 7.34, where the children of Israel are called οἱ οὐράνιοι παῖδες, we should presumably translate 'children of God'<sup>147</sup> rather than 'servants of God'.<sup>148</sup> The singular παῖς Θεοῦ with the meaning

<sup>142</sup>Towards the end of the second century B.C. almost the whole of the O.T. already existed in the LXX translation. The evidence both of the Prologue to *Ecclesiasticus* and *Ep. Ar.* points to this date. Therefore 100 B.C. is the starting point for the following treatment of παῖς Θεοῦ.

<sup>143</sup>Leisegang, *Index*, 619.

<sup>144</sup>Schl. *Theol. d. Judi.*, 50.

<sup>145</sup>The meaning 'children of God' results from the interchangeability of παῖδες σου (9.4; 12.20) and νιότ σου (9.7; 12.19, 21). This is confirmed by what is said below, p. 44, on 2.13.

<sup>146</sup>καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἴκανοι θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, none the less 'of his Logos'. The context shows that the meaning is 'children of God'.

<sup>147</sup>As also O. Michel, *Hebraerbrief*, on 2.10.

<sup>148</sup>Thus the v.l. οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ; cf. 7.33.

'child of God' is only found once, Wisd. 2.13.<sup>149</sup> Here the godless say of the just παιδα κυρίου ἔστον δύομάζει. In view of the linguistic usage of the LXX (cf. p. 35) the translation 'servant of God' seems the obvious one.<sup>150</sup> But in the following verse it is further stated that the righteous boasts of God as his father (2.16) and in 2.18 he is described as υἱὸς θεοῦ.<sup>151</sup> Since, moreover, in Wisd. we find that the plural phrases παιδες θεοῦ and υἱοὶ θεοῦ are interchangeable, the translation 'child of God' must be regarded as the right one.<sup>152</sup> Now in 5.1 ff. Wisd. depicts the righteous in terms derived from Isa. 52.13 ff. (cf. p. 53). This means that the suffering servant of Deut. Isa. has become in Wisd.—by means of the dual significance of παιδις—the child of God who in spite of all suffering and misery knows himself to be safe with his Father and rejoices in the fact. The rare appearance of παιδις θεοῦ with the meaning 'child of God' is only partially explained by the fact that Hellenistic Judaism prefers for 'child of God' υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (occasionally τέκνον τοῦ θεοῦ). The real reason for this rarity is that late Judaism less frequently uses the image of a child<sup>153</sup> than that of a servant<sup>154</sup> to describe the relation of the individual or the people to God.

(ii) Παιδις Θεοῦ = 'servant of God'. Παιδις Θεοῦ more frequently means 'servant of God' in the period subsequent to 100 B.C., which concerns us. This meaning is certainly present in Bar. 1.20; 2.28; Deut. 34.5 'Ἄλλ where Moses is called παιδις of God, since the description of Moses as 'servant of God' is established linguistic usage (cf. n. 183). The same applies to the denotation of the prophets, Bar. 2.20, 24; I Esd. 8.82 by the stereotyped formula (cf. n. 167) τῶν παιδῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν. When παιδες is used of the three men in the fiery furnace (Δαν. 3.95 Θ);<sup>155</sup>

<sup>149</sup> Possibly Bar. 3.36 should be added; see p. 45.

<sup>150</sup> So K. Siegfried in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, I, 1900, 483, cf. Wolff, 41.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. 5.5: πῶς κατελογίσθη (the just) ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ; ask the sinners at the last judgement.

<sup>152</sup> So also the commentaries by O. F. Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des AT*, 6, 1860; P. Heinisch, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, 1912, 51; F. Feldmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, 1926; J. Fichtner, *Weisheit Salomos* (Handbuch zum A.T. II), 6, 1938; further Dalman, I, 31, n. 1; Bousset, 48, 54; S-B., I, 219; Dalman WJ, 278. Cf. the Syriac of Wisd. 2.13, 18; אֶלְלוֹת בָּרַה—Son of God.

<sup>153</sup> See S.-B., I, 219 f., 371 f.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Bousset, 54; Schl. *Theol. d. Judt.*, 50.

<sup>155</sup> Also Josephus, *Ant.* 10.215.

3.93 Θ δοῦλοι [of God]), the meaning ‘servant of God’ is again assured. As for I Esd. 6.13 (δοῦλοι II Ἔσδρ. (Ezra) 5.11), 27, the context makes this meaning clear. The meaning of παῖς (of God) can only be doubtful now in those texts already mentioned (cf. n. 177) where the phrase is used collectively; since however in Bar. παῖς θεοῦ is otherwise always used with the meaning ‘servant of God’ (1.20; 2.20, 24, 28), this meaning is to be accepted for Bar. 3.36: Ἰακὼβ τῷ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ, and thence also for Ps. Sol. 12.6; 17.21; in Luke 1.54 a comparison with 1.69 yields the same conclusion. This survey shows that in passages where παῖς θεοῦ has the meaning ‘servant of God’ the O.T. usage of עָבֵד יְהוָה, with its various implications, persists.

## 2. THE PERSISTENCE OF THE O.T. RELIGIOUS USAGE OF עָבֵד יְהוָה

The O.T. עָבֵד יְהוָה lives on not only in the Greek παῖς θεοῦ, and the following survey, therefore, must not be confined to παῖς θεοῦ but must (especially in view of the great significance of the expression עָבֵד יְהוָה for the N.T.) include the occurrence of עָבֵד (of God), אֶלְעָבֵד (of God),<sup>156</sup> מֶשֶׁרֶת (of God), שָׁמֶן (of God);<sup>157</sup> equal to διάκονος θεοῦ;<sup>158</sup> δοῦλος θεοῦ; θεράπων θεοῦ;<sup>159</sup> οἰκέτης θεοῦ;<sup>160</sup> ὑπηρέτης θεοῦ;<sup>161</sup> ὑποδιάκονος θεοῦ.<sup>162</sup> Allowing for the fact that the phrase ‘my servant’, so frequent in the mouth of God in the O.T., now appears only rarely<sup>163</sup> because the time of the revelation ended with the death of the last writing prophet, we can discern the essentially unchanged persistence of the O.T. עָבֵד יְהוָה—with, of course, characteristic variations of emphasis.

(i) *Παῖς Θεοῦ as self-descriptive of the worshipper.* The very old humble self-description of the worshipper in the presence of his God as עָבֵד יְהוָה (cf. p. 14) continues to be used without

<sup>156</sup> Gen. 18.3 syr<sup>pal</sup>; Jer. 30.10 syr<sup>pal</sup>.

<sup>157</sup> For עָבֵד cf. n. 194.

<sup>158</sup> Only in Josephus, *Bell.* 3.354.

<sup>159</sup> Only in Philo, Leisegang, *Index*, 384.

<sup>160</sup> Only I Esd. 4.59; Eccl. 36.17(22) (cf. n. 169).

<sup>161</sup> Only in Philo, Leisegang, *Index*, 802.

<sup>162</sup> Only in Philo, Leisegang, *Index*, 804.

<sup>163</sup> II Esd. (IV Ezra) 7.28 f.; 13.32, 37, 52; 14.9; Syr. Bar. 70.9, cf. 49 f. Each of these passages deals with the designation of the Messiah as ‘my (God’s) servant’.

modification.<sup>164</sup> But it can hardly be an accident that in the Greek renderings (as distinct from the LXX where παῖς alternates with δοῦλος) for the period after 100 B.C., examples of παῖς (of God) are wanting, and only δοῦλος and διάκονος (of God) are attested (cf. n. 166, 183, 184); the worshipper's awareness of the distance of God is intended to be unequivocally expressed.

(ii) *The plural 'servants of God'.* Likewise the plural 'servants of God', as in the O.T. (cf. p. 16),<sup>165</sup> remains the current description of the Israelites<sup>166</sup> and the prophets.<sup>167</sup> A new fact is that in contrast with O.T. usage where it appears relatively seldom, and almost always in late writings,<sup>168</sup> the phrase 'servants of Yahweh' occurs with increasing frequency<sup>169</sup> as a description of the

<sup>164</sup> δοῦλος (of God): Wisd. 9.5; Δαν. 3.33, 44 Θ (also LXX); 9.17 Θ (LXX παῖς); II Mac. 8.29. οὐκέτης (of God): I Esd. 4.59. διάκονος (of God): Josephus, *Bell.* 3.354. Examples preserved in Latin, Ethiopic, Arabic and Armenian translations only: II Esd. (IV Ezra) 5.45, 56; 6.12; 7.75, 102; 8.6, 24; 10.37; 12.8; 13.14; those preserved in the Syriac only: *Syr. Bar.* 14.15; 48.11; 54.6. עֲבָדִים (of God): Ecclus. 36.17 (22) and the 16th Beraka of the XVIII Blessings (Palestinian recension); Shema benediction (W. Staerk, *Altjüdische liturgische Gebete*<sup>2</sup> [Kleine Text 58, ed. H. Lietzmann], 1930, 6). טַלְיָךְ in humble address to God, Gen. 18.3 syrpal (*Targ. Onkelos and Jonathan I*: [=Heb.]; in the Samaritan *Targ.* [publ. A. Brüll, 1879]: שְׁמַשְׁכָן).

<sup>165</sup> Israelites: cf. Lindhagen 82 ff.; prophets: ibid., 277–80. Cf. p. 22 above.

<sup>166</sup> Jub. 23.30; *Syr. Bar.* 14.15. παῖδες (of God): I Esd. 6.13; Sib. V. 68 (on II Mac. 7.34 see p. 43). δοῦλοι (of God): II Mac. 7.34; 8.29; Philo, *Migr. Abr.* 45. According to Josephus, *Ant.* 11.101, the Jews in the Cyrus edict are designated δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ; and ibid. 90, they call themselves: δοῦλοι τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ. The expression δοῦλος θεοῦ is, however, infrequent in Josephus (cf. Schl. *Theol. d. Judt.*, 49 f.). The predominance of δοῦλος both in the self-description of the worshipper (n. 164) and in the designation of the Israelites as the servants of God is significant. עֲבָדִים (of God): *Mekhilta Ex.* 22.20; *Siphre Num.* 15.41 §115; and further in prayers (cf. n. 164). עֲבָדִיא (of God): *Targ. Isa.* 48.20. מְשֻׁרְתִּים (of God): *Mekhilta Ex.* 22.20.

<sup>167</sup> παῖδες (of God): I Esd. 8.82; Bar. 2.20, 24 (in all three places, τῶν παῖδων σου [of God] τῶν προφητῶν [as a formula; cf. Ἱερ. 33.5; 42.15; 51.4]). δοῦλοι (of God): Δαν. 9.6, 10 Θ (LXX: παῖδες θεοῦ), cf. Rev. 11.18. ὑπηρέται (of God): Philo, *Decal.* 178. ὑποδιάκονοι (of God): ibid. עֲבָדִיא (of God): *Targ. Isa.* 50.10. Also in the recently discovered Palestinian texts the prophets are repeatedly called 'servants of God'; see *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (op. cit. in n. 69) I, plate 55, col. 2, line 9; plate 58, col. 7, line 5; ibid. II, 2: 'Manual of Discipline', 1951, col. 1, line 3.

<sup>168</sup> Lindhagen, 233–62.

<sup>169</sup> παῖδες (of God): Josephus, *Ant.* 10.215 (of the three men in the fiery furnace as Δαν. 3.93, 95 LXX; 3.95 Θ). δοῦλοι (of God): II Mac. 7.6 (=LXX Deut. 32.36), 33; 8.29; *Ps. Sol.* 2.37; 10.4; Philo, *Det. Pot. Ins.* 146; *Rer. Div. Her.* 7; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.90, 101; Δαν. 3.85 Θ. θεράποντες (of God): Philo, *Det. Pot. Ins.* 62. עֲבָדִיא

pious. The priests too are described in this way<sup>170</sup> after the O.T. pattern.<sup>171</sup> Further, proselytes<sup>172</sup> are now at times so named, as are parents<sup>173</sup> and the angels.<sup>174</sup>

(iii) *The collective linguistic use.* The new collective use of the singular עָבֹד יְהוָה as a description of Israel, first clearly to be seen in Deut. Isa. (cf. p. 17),<sup>175</sup> also persists after 100 B.C. both in Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism. But examples of the use of the title 'servant of God' for Israel, if we exclude O.T. quotations and late translations of the O.T.,<sup>176</sup> are not numerous.<sup>177</sup>

(of God): *Targ.* Isa. 42.19 (n. 219); 44.26 (n. 221). The description of the pious as οἰκέται (of God), *Eccl.* 36.17 (22) § A, is original, as the Heb. text (עֲבָדִים) shows.

The reading ἵκετῶν (suppliants) instead of οἰκετῶν is a scribal error.

<sup>170</sup> Θεράποντες (of God): *Philo, Spec. Leg.* I, 242; in the same place the high priest is called (*ibid.* 116) ὑποδιάκονος (of God). λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ: *Spec. Leg.* IV, 191.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Lindhagen, 107–20.

<sup>172</sup> עֲבָדִים (of God): *Mekhilta Ex.* 22.20. מְשֻׁרְתִּים (of God): *ibid.* The LXX in translating Isa. 66.14 עֲבָדִים (of God) by σεβόμενοι αὐτόν (§ A) or φοβούμενοι αὐτόν (B) is thinking no doubt of the proselytes.

<sup>173</sup> ὑπηρέται (of God): *Philo, Decal.* 119.

<sup>174</sup> δοῦλοι (of God): *Ps. Sol.* 18.21. Θεράποντες (of God): *Philo, Fug.* 67. ὑπηρέται (of God): *Philo, Mut. Nom.* 87; *Som.* I, 143. ὑποδιάκονοι (of God): *Philo, Spec. Leg.* I, 66; *Migr. Abr.* 115. מְשֻׁרְתִּים (of God): *Heb. Enoch* 1.8; 4.1; 6.2 f.; 19.6; 40.1. שְׁמַיִן (of God): *Mekhilta Ex.* 20.23 par. B. *Rosh Hashana* 24b; *Targ.* Isa. 6.2, etc. In *Spec. Leg.* I, 31 Philo calls the heavenly bodies ὑποδιάκονοι θεοῦ. In B. *Chul.* 60a the sun is described as one of the שְׁמַיִן of God.

<sup>175</sup> Isa. 41.8, 9; 44.1, 2, 21 (twice); 45.4; 48.20; 49.3; to which must be added as the tenth instance LXX Isa. 42.1: Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου (M.T. only עָבֹד יְהוָה), see p. 52. Further, outside Deut. Isa., in the Heb. text Jeremiah 30.10 (missing in the LXX, though Θ offers παῖς); 46.27 f. (=LXX Ἰερ. 26.27: δοῦλος, v. 28: παῖς); Ps. 136.22 (=LXX ψ 135.22: δοῦλος); on Ezek. 28.25 and 37.25 cf. n. 41. Also without Heb. equivalent: LXX III Bar. 8.34 BA; 16.2 A; ψ 134.12 § A (in all three places: δοῦλος).

In all these instances 'Jacob' and 'Israel' have collective significance. Since the application of this title to the people ('my servant Israel', 'Jacob' [collectively]) is not certainly attested in the O.T. before Deut. Isa. in all those passages the influence of Deut. Isa. is to be assumed. Cf. Bentzen, 63, and n. 35 above.

<sup>176</sup> E.g., *Jer.* 30.10 Θ: σὺ δὲ μὴ φοβοῦ, παῖς μου Ἰακώβ (syrpal: עָבֹד יְהוָה; *Targ.* עֲבָדִי). For the translation and the understanding of the collective servant texts of Deut. Isa. (enumerated in n. 175), in late Palestinian Judaism, see p. 54 below. We shall remark here that *Targ.* Isa. (following the Heb. text) 41.8, 9; 44.1, 2, 21 (twice); 45.4; 49.3 retains the phrase 'servant of God' and understands it to mean Israel collectively; only in 48.20 has the *Targ.* replaced the singular of the Heb. text by the plural.

<sup>177</sup> Bar. 3.36: Ἰακώβ τῷ παιδὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ (cf. LXX Isa. 44.2: παῖς μου Ἰακώβ καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος Ἰσραὴλ ὃν ἔξελεξάμην); *Ps. Sol.*, 12.6: Ἰσραὴλ παῖδα αὐτοῦ (of God); 17.21: Ἰσραὴλ παῖδά σου (of God); cf. Luke 1.54 (reference to Isa. 41.8) and p. 79 below; for rabbinic examples cf. n. 213.

(iv) Παῖς θεοῦ as a title of honour for outstanding instruments of God. Finally עֶבֶד יְהוָה, in accordance with general oriental and pre-exilic usage, continues to be used as a title of honour for outstanding instruments<sup>178</sup> of God (cf. pp. 18 ff.), though apart from scriptural quotations,<sup>179</sup> almost only in old formulae—especially prayers. Examples are not numerous. In Philo this usage is altogether absent.<sup>180</sup> In Josephus we find only the description of Moses as δοῦλος θεοῦ,<sup>181</sup> and of the three men in the fiery furnace as παιδεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>182</sup> In the whole of the *Mishnah* the title ‘servant of God’ appears only three times and then only in the three confessional formulae of the high priest on the Day of Atonement; in these three texts the formula is: בְּכַתּוֹב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד [Yoma, 3.8 [=T. Yoma, 2.1]; 4.2; 6.2]. This title of honour is firmly established only for Moses<sup>183</sup> and secondarily for David;<sup>184</sup> occasionally it is used for Noah,<sup>185</sup>

<sup>178</sup>G. Sass quite rightly stresses ('Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus', *ZNW*, 40, 1941, 24–32) that the title ‘servant of God’ in the O.T. and the N.T. conveys the thought of divine election. The decisive point is not the readiness to serve on the part of the human being concerned, but the divine appointing.

<sup>179</sup>*Siphre Deut.* §27, on 3.24, produces a long list of these O.T. figures described as ‘servants of God’.

<sup>180</sup>It is significant for Philo that he replaces the expression Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου (LXX Gen. 18.17) by Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ φίλου μου (*Sobr.* 56). Cf. Katz (loc. cit. in n. 116).

<sup>181</sup>Josephus, *Ant.*, 5.39.

<sup>182</sup>Josephus, *Ant.*, 10.215.

<sup>183</sup>παῖς (of God): Bar. 1.20; 2.28 (both texts in one and the same prayer of penitence). δοῦλος (of God): Josephus, *Ant.*, 5.39 (prayer), cf. Rev. 15.3. θεράπων (of God): Wisd. 10.16 (poetic praise of the divine wisdom), cf. I Cl. 51.3, 5; 53.5; Barn. 14.4. עֶבֶד (of God): IV Ezra 14.31 *syr* (Ezra's last words to the people), see l. 13 above (formula for the confession of sins). The later Greek translations call Moses δοῦλος (of God): Ex. 4.10 'A; Josh. 1.15 'A, Σ, Θ; Δαν. 9.11 Θ; only Deut. 34.5 'Αλλ has παῖς κυρίου.

<sup>184</sup>The description of David as ‘servant of God’ is to be found solely in prayers (with the exception of the later O.T. translations); I Mac. 4.30 (τοῦ δούλου σου Δαυΐδ); IV Ezra 3.23 and the 15th Beraka of the XVIII Blessings (Babylonian recension), v.l. (+ דוד עבדך; an old Musaf prayer which is interpolated on the days of the new moon into the 17th (16th) benediction of the XVIII Blessings reads: זכרון משיח סדור חפלהות בן דוד עבדך (W. Heidenhein, 1886, 21; S. R. Hirsch, שפת אמרת ישראל Israels Gebete, 1921, 146, 274, 624); and the prayer of the passover *haggada* דוד בן-ישי עבדך משיחך ובקעהלוות before the fourth cup reads. Cf. Luke 1.69; Acts 4.25; Did. 9.2 (in all three places παῖς [of God]); these early Christian usages, too, come from prayers. The later Greek translations of the Bible always call David δοῦλος (of God): III Bas 11.36 'A, Σ; 14.8 'A; ψ 35.1 'A, Σ; Isa. 37.35 'A, Σ, Θ.

<sup>185</sup>IV Ezra 3.11 Armenian (prayer).

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

Abraham,<sup>186</sup> Isaac,<sup>187</sup> Jacob (cf. n. 186), Aaron,<sup>188</sup> Elijah,<sup>189</sup> and the three men in the fiery furnace.<sup>190</sup> In the mouth of non-Jews the title 'servant of God' is applied to Zerubbabel<sup>191</sup> and, following the O.T. text, to Daniel<sup>192</sup> and the three men in the fiery furnace.<sup>193</sup> In *Heb. Enoch Metatron*, the heavenly vice-gerent, bears the title עֶבֶר (of God).<sup>194</sup>

(v) 'Servant of God' as denoting the Messiah. Besides all this, 'servant of God' is met with denoting the Messiah. In the O.T. itself the Messiah is five times called 'my servant': Ezek. 34.23 f.; 37.24 f. (all four texts: עֶבֶד יְהוָה) and Zech. 3.8.<sup>195</sup> Subsequently, in II Esd. (IV Ezra) 7.28; 13.32, 37, 52; 14.9 (throughout 'my servant'); 7.28 v.l., 29; Syr. Bar. 70.9 ('my servant, the Messiah');<sup>196</sup> Targ. Isa. 42.1; 43.10; 52.13; Targ. Zech. 3.8; (in all

<sup>186</sup> II Mac. 1.2 'Αβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ (of God) τῶν πιστῶν (blessing); Syr. Bar. 4.4 (divine discourse).

<sup>187</sup> Cf. n. 186; Δαν. 3.35 Θ (=LXX): διὸ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν δοῦλόν σου (prayer).

<sup>188</sup> Heb. Enoch 2.3: משֶׁרֶת (of God).

<sup>189</sup> The third benediction after the reading of the prophets in the worship service: 'make us to rejoice, Yahweh, our God' בָּאֵלָיו הָנְבִיא עֶבֶד (Hirsch, op. cit. in n. 184, 342).

<sup>190</sup> Josephus, *Ant.*, 10.215; τοὺς παῖδας τοῦ θεοῦ. See n. 169.

<sup>191</sup> I. 'Εσδρ. 6.27: τὸν παῖδα κυρίου Ζοροβάθελ; cf. n. 195.

<sup>192</sup> Δαν. 6.20 Θ: δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (vocative).

<sup>193</sup> Δαν. 3.95 Θ (παῖδες of God); 3.93 Θ (δοῦλοι of God).

<sup>194</sup> 1.4; 10.3; 48 C 1. D 1. (17th of the 70 names). D 9. Also in later times the Metatron keeps the title עֶבֶד יהוָה (cf. Odeberg II, 28). If he is called עֶזֶר, Heb. Enoch 2.2; 3.2; 4.1 f., this word as elsewhere (examples in Odeberg II, 173) is the equivalent of עֶבֶד in the meaning 'servant'. Cf. also n. 256.

<sup>195</sup> Cf. further Hag. 2.23 where Zerubbabel is called עֶבֶד (LXX: τὸν δοῦλόν μου) and receives the promise that he shall be 'as a signet'.

<sup>196</sup> In the passages alluded to in IV Ezra the description of the Messiah fluctuates in the different versions. The rival terms are 'my son' (throughout *Lat.* and *Syr.*; *Eth.* 13.52; 14.9; *Sabidic* translation 13.32), 'my child' (*Arab.*, edition by G. H. A. Ewald, 1863, 7.28), 'my young man' (*ibid.* 13.32, 37, 52; 14.9; *Arab.*, edition by J. Gildemeister, 1877, 13.37; *Eth.* 13.37) and 'my servant' (*Arab.*, ed. J. Gildemeister, 13.32, 52; 14.9; *Eth.* 7.29). All these translations go back to the παῖς of the Greek source, which lies behind the surviving translations of IV Esd. Cf. B. Violet, *Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt* (GCS 32, 1924, 74 f.): 'No Christian would ever have changed υἱός to παῖς but the opposite might easily have happened.' This conclusive proof has met with general consent. Cf. Harnack, *Die Bezeichnung Jesu als "Knecht Gottes"*, 212 f.; A. v. Gall, «Βασιλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ», 1926, 417; Gressmann, *Messias*, 383 f.; J. Jeremias, 'Erlöser und Erlösung', 110 f.; and «Αμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ», 120 n. 29; Buber, 77; Torrey, 'The Messiah', 260. J. Drummond had already correctly judged the state of affairs in *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, 285–9; and Boussel had independently recognized the truth (53) on the basis of IV Ezra given

four texts (**עבדי משיחא**); *Targ.* Ezek. 34.23 f.; 37.24 f. (in all four texts **עבדי דוד**). This exhausts the examples. Quite striking is the complete absence of the denotation of the Messiah as 'servant of God' in the whole of the rest of rabbinic literature, apart from quotations. With regard to the reason for this silence cf. p. 75 below. Thus in the whole of the O.T. and late Jewish literature the description of the Messiah as God's servant occurs without exception only in the form 'my servant' and only in the mouth of God. We have here a biblical phrase which survived up to the end of the first century A.D., then disappeared and survived only in quotation. 'Servant of God' as a real title for the Messiah never existed in Judaism, as is shown by its restriction to divine discourse.

### 3. INTERPRETATIONS OF DEUTERO-ISAIAH 'SERVANT OF GOD' PASSAGES

With reference to the N.T. it is of special importance to note how late Judaism interpreted the '*ebed*' passages of Deut. Isa. If we except three places where historical figures are named **עבדי** by God (Isa. 20.3: Isaiah; 22.20: Eliakim; 37.35: David), in the whole book the singular 'servant of God' occurs only in chapters 41–53, the number of occurrences being nineteen: 41.8, 9; 42.1, 19 (twice); 43.10; 44.1, 2, 21 (twice), 26 (but cf. n. 221); 45.4; 48.20; 49.3, 5, 6; 50.10; 52.13; 53.11. For the investigation of the interpretation of these passages in late Judaism it is essential that various all too common sources of error should be avoided. First it must be borne in mind that, like the distinction between Proto-, Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, so also the modern delimitation of the servant songs is completely unknown to that period. Hence the study must not be limited to the latter or to Isa. 53. Then it must be realized that the atomistic character of exegesis at that time does not permit us to presuppose a uniform interpretation of the '*ebed*'; *Targ.* Isa., for example, explains certain servant passages as applying to the people, others as referring to the prophets and yet others as speaking of the Messiah (pp. 66ff. and n. 291). The conception of the '*ebed*' as it is formulated in modern research 'does

---

by B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apokalypse I (IV Ezra)* (GCS 18, 1910). *Syr. Bar.* 70.9 calls the Messiah **עבדי**, the Greek text lying behind the Syriac also probably reads παῖς; this may be assumed because of the state of affairs in IV Ezra which has παῖς.

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

not exist at all in Jewish interpretation'.<sup>197</sup> Interpretations of single passages must therefore not be generalized. Further, careful distinction must be made between mere allusions and applications of isolated words in other connexions, whatever they may be, on the one hand, and deliberate exegesis on the other.<sup>198</sup> The latter alone has real weight. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the Diaspora, partly as a result of divergent readings in the LXX, developed its own special traditions of exegesis; Hellenistic and Palestinian statements must not be placed on the same level.

(i) *Hellenistic Judaism.* (a) While the LXX predominantly renders Deutero-Isaiah's **עֶבֶד יְהוָה** by παῖς,<sup>199</sup> though δοῦλος does appear three times,<sup>200</sup> subsequently, however, δοῦλος completely disappears in references to the servant of God based on Deut. Isa. The servant is consistently called παῖς in Jewish Hellenistic literature subsequent to the composition of the LXX.<sup>201</sup> That remains so until A.D. 100. As a result of its ambiguity the phrase παῖς θεοῦ could be understood either as 'servant of God' (thus the LXX) or as 'child of God' (thus Wisd., cf. p. 43 above). The further the distance from the original Hebrew text the more the second conception ('child of God') prevailed in the Jewish Hellenistic understanding of Isa. 40 ff.

Only after the beginning of the second century does the picture change, and that radically. Aquila<sup>202</sup> (cf. n. 263) always

<sup>197</sup>Cf. Fischel, 54.

<sup>198</sup>Rightly stressed by Moore, I, 229, 541; III, 166 n. 255 (on I, 551); cf. further Schlatter *BFT* 16.6, 1912, 50; K.G. Kuhn, *Siphre Num.*, 'Rabbinische Texte', 2nd series, Tannaitische Midrashim, 1933 ff., 527; also Sjöberg, 119. Fischel, 59 n. 24, sought to establish rules for the distinction between mere allusion and deliberate exegesis.

<sup>199</sup>41.8, 9; 42.1, 23 Ι; 43.10; 44, 1, 2, 21 (twice), 26; 45.4; 49.6; 50.10; 52.13; also plural οἱ παῖδες μου for Heb. **עֲבָדָיו** 42.19a.

<sup>200</sup>48.20; 49.3, 5; also plural οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ for Heb. **עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה**, 42.19b; and δουλεύοντα for Heb. **עֲבָדָיו**, 53.11.

<sup>201</sup>J. Jeremias, « Ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ », 118–21.

<sup>202</sup>Justin, *Dial.* constantly alludes to a new Greek translation of the O.T. deviating from the LXX and regarded as authoritative by his opponents (120.4; 124.2 f.; 131.1 and 137.3) and also to the slight esteem in which the LXX was held by them (43.8; 67.1; 68.7; 71.1–73.5; 84.3 f.). A. Rahlfs has attempted to show that this new translation is that of Aquila ('Über Theodotion-Lesarten im N.T. und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin', *ZNW*, 20, 1921, 194–9) for Micah 4.1 (quoted Justin, *Dial.* 109.2). Origen, *Ep. ad Julium Africanum* (Migne, *PG* 11, 52 B) says of Aquila: φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαιοὺς ἡρμηνεύειν τὴν γραφήν· φύμαλιστα εἰώθασι οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἐβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὃς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένω (because he had succeeded best of all).

calls Deutero-Isaiah's servant δοῦλος.<sup>203</sup> The question as to what determined his choice of word is answered by the observation that he also renders עָבֵד by δοῦλος outside Isa. 40 ff. Thus he is merely following his strictly practised translation technique of rendering Heb. roots everywhere by the same Greek roots.<sup>204</sup> Hence for his translation of עָבֵד by δοῦλος in Isa. 40 ff. we may ascribe to him no other motive than the desire for accurate translation.<sup>205</sup> His example was followed by his successors. Theodotion also renders עָבֵד by δοῦλος. Accordingly he calls the servant of God δοῦλος in all the extant servant passages in Isa. 40 ff. (41.8, 9; 42.1; 49.6); only in 42.1 Θ a v.l. reads παῖς (=LXX).<sup>206</sup> The translation of the Jewish Christian Symmachus, following the model of Aquila, renders עָבֵד as δοῦλος.<sup>207</sup>

(b) The exegesis of Deutero-Isaiah's servant of God in Hellenistic Judaism was determined by the fact that the LXX had extended the collective interpretation which the Heb. text gave in nine places (cf. n. 175) to other passages (cf. p. 41 above). Thus in Isa. 42.19 the LXX rendered the singular of the Heb. text twice as a plural ('עָבְדִי'=LXX οἱ παῖδες μου; =LXX οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ).<sup>208</sup> Especially far-reaching in consequence was the fact that the LXX understood the phrase 'my servant' as collective also in Isa. 42.1, and expressed this sense by the addition of the word 'Ιακώβ: Ιακώβ ὁ παῖς μου (Heb.

<sup>203</sup>Preserved in Isa. 41.8, 9; 42.1; 49.6; 52.13.

<sup>204</sup>Aquila practises this principle with such astonishing consistency that one is led simply to suppose that before beginning his translation he prepared for himself a Heb.-Greek Lexicon. Cf. *Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs, 1935, I, x.

<sup>205</sup>The supposition expressed by Euler (88) with reservations, by Zolli (229 f.), and by J. Jeremias, 'Zum Problem der Deutung von Js. 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum' in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel), 1950, 115 f., that Aquila's disinclination to render עָבֵד by παῖς is connected with anti-Christian tendencies, cannot therefore be maintained; Hegermann, 29 f.

<sup>206</sup>Thus Q and the syro-hexaplist translation. Theodoret of Cyrus maintained, however, that Theodotion translated Isa. 42.1 עָבֵד by δοῦλος. It speaks for the correctness of the reading δοῦλος that Theodotion always appears to render עָבֵד by δοῦλος and that παῖς (cf. Hatch and Redpath ad loc.) simply does not occur in the fragments which have come down to us from him (except the v.l. on Isa. 42.1).

<sup>207</sup>Preserved in Isa. 41.8, 9; 42.1, 19 (twice); 49.6; 52.13.

<sup>208</sup>Cf. further Isa. 44.26 where LXX (A) translates עָבְדֹו (of God) plurally by παῖδων αὐτοῦ and Isa. 48.20 where LXX (A) renders עָבְדּוֹ יְעַקֹּב by τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ 'Ιακώβ.

## *The Servant of God in Late Judaism*

only עַבְדִּי). Thus there arose a bifurcation in the understanding of Isa. 42.1 ff.; following the LXX, Hellenistic Judaism refers the text to the people of Israel,<sup>209</sup> and Palestinian Judaism understands it throughout as messianic (see pp. 59, 61 and n. 262; pp. 67, 71 and n. 306).

A further similar bifurcation is to be noted with regard to Isa. 53. Hellenistic Judaism, so far as we know, interprets the suffering servant in a collective sense, as distinct from its messianic interpretation in Palestinian Judaism. This collective interpretation we find first in Wisd., which describes the just man, called παῖς κυρίου 'child of God' (2.13, cf. p. 44), and his fate in close connexion with Isa. 52.13 ff. This applies above all to the final judgement scene where (Wisd. 4.20 ff.) the sinners confess, trembling, that they have scorned and misesteemed the just and have departed from the way of truth. Here, in trait after trait, there is allusion to Isa. 52.13 ff.; cf. Wisd. 4.18, with Isa. 53.3; Wisd. 4.20; 5.3, with Isa. 52.15; Wisd. 5.3 f., with Isa. 53.2-4; Wisd. 5.5 (κληρος), with Isa. 53.12 (κληρονομήσει); Wisd. 5.6 f., with Isa. 53.6; Wisd. 5.15 f., with Isa. 53.10-12; further, Wisd. 2.13, with Isa. 52.13; 53.11; Wisd. 2.19 f., with Isa. 53.7 f.<sup>210</sup> The παῖς θεοῦ of Isa. 52.13 ff. is thus for Wisdom the type of the just man. Obviously then for this writer the collective interpretation of Isa. 53 was current.<sup>211</sup> We find a further example in Origen, *Contr. Cels.* 1.55: he says that Jews with whom he came into contact interpreted Isa. 53 collectively 'of the people considered as a person who had been scattered and tormented.' Whereas for Palestinian Judaism of the first millennium A.D. the collective application of the servant of Isa. 53 to Israel is completely unknown (it appears first in Rashi, died 1105),<sup>212</sup> for Hellenistic Judaism it was usual, as Wisdom shows. We must therefore assume that the informants of Origen were Hellenistic Jews.

To sum up, Hellenistic Judaism is inclined to understand the παῖς θεοῦ of Deutero-Isaiah as 'child of God' and prefers the collective interpretation.

<sup>209</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 123.8 f.; cf. Dalman, I. 32 and Fischel, 59.

<sup>210</sup> Cf. Dalman, I. 32, n. 1.

<sup>211</sup> W. Staerk, 'Zur Exegese von Jesaias 53 im Diasporajudentum', *ZNW*, 35, 1936, 308.

<sup>212</sup> Dalman, I. 34 f.; S.-B. I, 481.

(ii) *Palestinian Judaism*. In Palestinian Judaism of the first millennium three distinct interpretations of the Deutero-Isaiah servant are found. It is important to note that—with some exceptions—these three interpretations do not overlap but each of them is limited to certain of the nineteen passages (cf. p. 50) referring to the servant.

(a) *The collective interpretation* (Isa. 41.8 f.; 42.19 [twice]; 44.1, 2, 21 [twice]; 45.4; 48.20; 49.3, 5 f. [?]; 50.10). In the Heb. text the collective application of Deutero-Isaiah's servant of God to the people of Israel was present in nine of the nineteen passages (Isa. 41.8 f.; 44.1, 2, 21 [twice]; 45.4; 48.20; 49.3). Thus was established<sup>213</sup> for the following centuries the application to Israel of these nine passages, as *Targ. Isa.* shows (see n. 176). Under the influence of Isa. 49.3 ('My servant art thou, Israel') the *Targ.* appears, moreover, to see an allusion to Israel in the following verses (5, 6)<sup>214</sup>. Other servant passages were not in the older rabbinic tradition, as distinct from the Hellenistic (cf. pp. 52 f.), applied to Israel.<sup>215</sup> In particular, Isa. 53 in Palestinian, rabbinic Judaism of the first millennium A.D. was nowhere referred to Israel (cf. p. 53); rather in rabbinic literature the collective application to Israel was strictly confined to those passages and their context where the Heb. text demanded it.<sup>216</sup>

As far as the application of individual servant passages to the

<sup>213</sup> Applications of this text to Israel are to be found outside *Targ.* in the following places: Isa. 41.8f.: Luke 1.54; *Gen.R.* 44.3 on 15.1; Isa. 44.2; *Bar.* 3.36 (cf. n. 177); *Midr. Ps.* 111 §1; Isa. 49.3: *Sipre Deut.* §355 on 33.26, par. *Mekhilta Ex.* 15.2; *Lev.R.* 2 on 1.2; *Ex.R.* 21 on 14.15 (for further comments on Isa. 49.3 see Dalman, I, 97, n. 1).

<sup>214</sup> *Targ. Isa.* 49.5 f. is usually thus understood; cf. Dalman, I, 97, n. 1; Humbert, 25, n. 5; S.-B., II, 330; Seidelin, 202. But it cannot be stated quite confidently, in view of the alteration of the number of whom the *Targ.* was thinking in referring to the 'serving servant' (*Targ. Isa.* 49.5 singular) and the 'servants of God' (*Targ. Isa.* 49.6 plural). Fischel, 60, 74, rightly sets a question mark against the applications of *Targ. Isa.* 49.5 f. to Israel. (On the sentence construction and translation of *Targ. Isa.* 49.5 f. cf. the notes of Humbert, 25, n. 5, which are worth consideration.) For the interpretation of Isa. 49.6 in rabbinic literature cf. n. 305.

<sup>215</sup> According to Fischel, 76, Isa. 42.19 was referred to Israel in rabbinic literature, but he gives no example. Presumably he is thinking of *Targ. Isa.* 42.19 where, however, it is a question of penitent sinners (cf. n. 219).

<sup>216</sup> The correct observation of Fischel, 65 f., that 'in the tannaitic and amoraic periods, apart from the reports of Justin and Origen, applications to Israel in 42.1 ff., 50.4 ff. and ch. 53 are lacking', must be extended to include the points (1) that it should be made to cover all the servant passages of Deut. Isa. except those mentioned above; and (2) that for Palestinian rabbinic Judaism the reservation made with regard to Justin (cf. n. 209) and Origen (cf. p. 53), is to be expunged.

just, the prophets and the scribes, is concerned, the following points are to be noted: it is merely a question of *allusions* when in Eccl. 11.13<sup>217</sup> a free quotation from Isa. 52.15 is applied to the suffering saints (cf. *TWNT*, III, 30 n.17) and in Dan. 12.3<sup>218</sup> a phrase from Isa. 53.11 is applied, in the plural, to the teachers of Israel. But we have *exegesis* when in *Targ.* Isa. 42.19 (twice) the servant is connected with penitent sinners,<sup>219</sup> and in 50.10 with the prophets.<sup>220, 221</sup> In *B. Ber.* 5a (*Rab Huna*, died 297) and *Seder Eliahu R.* 7<sup>222</sup> Isa. 53.10 is applied to penitent sufferers; *B. Yoma* 86a, applies Isa. 49.3 (Abbaye, died 338/9) and *Seder Eliahu R.* 14 and 25<sup>223</sup> applies Isa. 53.11 to upright teachers of the torah; but in these last-named five cases words are isolated from their context, so that inferences with regard to the interpretation of the latter are precluded.<sup>224</sup> Only in isolated instances has Palestinian Judaism applied Deut. Isa. servant passages to the just, the prophets and the scribes.<sup>225</sup>

(b) *Application to the prophet Isaiah* (Isa. 49.5; 50.10). It must have seemed obvious to interpret some of the servant passages as self-expressions of the prophet; this is true especially of the description of suffering given in the first person in Isa. 50.4 ff., which reaches its climax in the summons to hear the voice of

<sup>217</sup> וַיִּתְהַגֵּן עֲלָיו רַבִּים ('and many will be astonished at him') is the earliest existing reference to Isa. 52.13 ff.

<sup>218</sup> מַצְדִּיקִים חֲרָבִים ('which have brought many to righteousness').

<sup>219</sup> *Targ.* Isa. 42.19: 'will not the wicked when they return be called "my servant" (Heb. עָבֹדֶךָ, *Targ. Codd.* also; only *Codex Orientalis*, 1474 [British Museum], has the plural עָבֹדֶיךָ)? If they return they will be called the "servants of God"' (Heb. עָבֹדֶךָ; *Targ.* has the plural עָבֹדֶיךָ).

<sup>220</sup> Heb. עָבֹדֶיךָ is rendered by the *Targ.* with נְבִיא.

<sup>221</sup> On the other hand it is questionable whether *Targ.* Isa. 44.26 belongs here. In this text the Heb. עָבֹדֶיךָ is indeed rendered by עָבֹדֶךָ. But the *parallelismus membrorum* makes it probable that the form עָבֹדֶיךָ was intended as a plural עָבֹדֶיךָ in the original text (thus *BHK*<sup>2,3</sup> ad loc.) and since the LXX (πατίσμων αὐτοῦ) has so understood the Heb. text, it is questionable whether the *Targ.* likewise has not so read the original text. In that case *Targ.* Isa. 44.26 would not be an example of the collective interpretation of the servant, but of the use of the plural to denote the pious. Cf. n. 169.

<sup>222</sup> S.-B., I, 484. At the earliest, second half of the fifth century; according to Strack, *Einl.* 220: second half of the tenth century.

<sup>223</sup> S.-B., I, 484 f.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. the warning of Moore, III, 166, n. 225.

<sup>225</sup> For mediaeval authors who represent this view, cf. Fischel, 61, 74-76.

the servant (v. 10). In point of fact the commentary of Jerome on Isaiah attests specifically, and with reference to v. 10, that the Jews explained this section as bearing on the prophet Isaiah himself.<sup>226</sup> Isa. 49.5,<sup>227</sup> which also has the 'I' form, is at times referred to Isaiah.<sup>228</sup> The extension of this interpretation to Isa. 53.7 f. in the question of the treasurer (Acts 8.34) has on the other hand no parallel in the history of the time.<sup>229</sup>

The recurring applications of individual servant passages to particular persons are without significance. For the linking of Isa. 41.8 with the patriarch Jacob (*Siphre Deut.* §27 on 3.24), of Isa. 43.10, with David (*Midr. Ps.* 51 §3 on 51.6), of Isa. 44.26 with the angel with whom Jacob wrestled (*Gen.R.* 78.3 on 32.27 f. by R. Levi *circa* 300), of Isa. 49.8 f. with Noah and his family<sup>230</sup> who left the ark with him, and of Isa. 50.10 with Abraham (*Gen. R.* 60 on 24.12);<sup>231</sup> as also the relating of Isa. 53.12 with Moses' eschatological reward (*Siphre Deut.* §355 on 33.21), with the jealous action of Phinehas (*Siphre Num.* §131 on 25.13) and with R. Akiba<sup>232</sup> or the men of the great synagogue (J. Sheq. 5.1 [48 c 48])<sup>233</sup>—all these are without exception references to single verses in isolation which give no clue as to how the rabbis concerned interpreted the respective contexts as a whole.<sup>234</sup> As regards the relating of Isa. 53.12 to Moses' act of

<sup>226</sup>In Migne, *PL* 24, 496. In *Lev.R.* 10.2 on 8.1, par. *Pesigta* 125b (ed. S. Buber, 1868), R. Jehuda Bar Simon (*circa* 330) explains Isa. 50.6 with reference to Isaiah. When *Targ.* Isa. 50.10 translates Heb. עֲבָדֵי יְהֹוָה by 'his (God's) servants the prophets' (n. 220) here too a reference to Isaiah is implied. Isa. 50.4–10 was at no time interpreted messianically in Judaism, cf. Seidelin 206, n. 28, and especially Fischel, 63, 74 f.; above lines 14 f.

<sup>227</sup>*Siphre Deut.* §27 on 3.24.

<sup>228</sup>Correspondingly Isa. 49.1 is referred to Isaiah: *Midr. Ps.* 9 §59 on 9.6, 43a; *Pesigta R.* 129a.

<sup>229</sup>In particular there is to be found in the reports about the martyrdom of Isaiah no allusion to the 'ebed, and this is pointed out by Fischel, 63.

<sup>230</sup>*Aggadat Bereshit* 7 (ed. A. Jellinek, *Ber-ha-Midrasch* IV [1857] 12).

<sup>231</sup>S.-B., II, 608.

<sup>232</sup>The author is R. Jona (*circa* 350).

<sup>233</sup>The last three texts in S.-B., I, 483 f.

<sup>234</sup>Schlatter, Moore, Kuhn, cf. n. 198. K. G. Kuhn rightly remarks in *Siphre Num.* (1933 ff.), 527, with reference to the relation of Isa. 53.12 to the jealous deed of Phinehas (*Siphre Num.* §131 on 25.13): 'thus this explanation does not suggest that the prophecy of Isa. 53.12 relates to Phinehas'. But Fischel, 63, n. 51 referring to Eccl. 48.10 (cf. p. 57) and Mark 9.13 sees in the relation of Isa. 53.12 to Phinehas more than an incidental homiletic allusion; but the equation of Phinehas and Elijah, which Fischel assumes for *Siphre Num.* §131, belongs only to the post-N.T. period (*TWNNT*, II, 935, 21 f.), and it is doubtful whether it is already present in *Siphre Num.* §131. Also K. G. Kuhn doubts it, as he has informed the author; otherwise S.-B., IV, 463.

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

intercession (*B. Sotah* 14a)<sup>235</sup> it has its source in R. Simlai (*circa* 250) who plays a part in Palestine tradition chiefly on account of his controversy with the Christians.<sup>236</sup> In applying Isa. 53.12 to Moses his object no doubt is to prevent Christian apologists from applying it to Jesus.<sup>237</sup> That is all the more likely as the same tendency with regard to Isa. 53.12 was already presumably at work in Theodotion in the second century A.D. (cf. pp. 65f.).

(c) *Messianic exegesis* (Isa. 42.1; 43.10; 49.6; 52.13; 53.11.) Messianic interpretations of certain Deut. Isa. servant passages can most probably be traced back to pre-Christian times (cf. p. 41).

(α) In Eccl. 48.10 one of the three tasks of the returning Elijah (cf. *TWNT*, II, 933, 12 ff.) is described as *לְהִכַּן שְׁבָטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*; the expression comes from Isa. 49.6 where the 'ebed receives the mission of *אֶת-שְׁבָטֵי יִצְחָק*? The restoration of the twelve tribes is a messianic task and its assignment to Elijah must have marked the latter as the coming saviour.<sup>238</sup> But since only a broad allusion to Isa. 49.6 is in question, conclusions about a messianic interpretation of Isa. 49.6 from Eccl. 48.10 alone are not quite secure<sup>239</sup> (but cf. n. 305). In any case it is significant that Eccl. explained the servant in Isa. 49.6 in an individual sense.

(β) In the *Testament of Benjamin* (second or first century B.C.) the patriarch at the beginning puts forward his brother Joseph as a model because he made intercession for his brothers with his father Jacob. In this connexion it is said in *Test. B.* 3.8 (Armenian): 'In thee (Joseph) will the heavenly prophecy be fulfilled which says that the innocent one will be defiled for the sake of the guilty and the sinless one will die for the impious.'<sup>240</sup> The heavenly prophecy must mean Isa. 53.<sup>241</sup> The possibility that

<sup>235</sup>S.-B., I, 483.

<sup>236</sup>Bacher, *Die Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, I, 1892, 555 f.

<sup>237</sup>Moore, III, 166, n. 254.

<sup>238</sup>Cf. *TWNT*, II, 933, 16 ff. and n. 17, also Dalman, I, 28; S.-B., IV, 780.

<sup>239</sup>Similarly, most recently, North, 7. More confident is the judgement of Dalman, I, 28.

<sup>240</sup>R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs translated*, 1908, 202. The text is found in all the manuscripts; but only the above-quoted Armenian translation is free from the Christian interpolations of the others.

<sup>241</sup>In particular as regards the 'tarnishing' of the just for the unjust, cf. the translation of מֹחַלְל Isa. 53.5 by βεβηλωμένος in Aquila and by אִינְתָּלְלָן in *Targ*. There was thus an old tradition which understood מֹחַלְל not as 'pierced' but as 'desecrated'.

*Test. B.* 3.8 (Armenian) is a Christian interpolation does not come into the question, for nowhere is there ascribed to Jesus descent from the tribe Joseph-Ephraim, but always Davidic descent (cf. υἱὸς Δαυὶδ) from the tribe of Judah (Heb. 7.14).<sup>242</sup> Since further the idea of a vicarious atoning death of the patriarch Joseph himself is nowhere else attested, the phrase 'in thee will the heavenly prophecy be fulfilled', probably refers not to Joseph himself but to his posterity (cf. for this type of phrase I Sam. 3.12-14), i.e., the Messiah from the house of Joseph.

In *Test. B.* 3.8 we have probably the oldest testimony to the expectation of a Messiah from the tribe of Joseph.<sup>243</sup> This passage should therefore be regarded as the oldest witness to the messianic exegesis of Isa. 53 (next to LXX, cf. p. 41).

(γ) The next relevant source from the point of view of time is the so-called Visionary Discourses<sup>244</sup> of the *Ethiopian Enoch* (chs. 37-71) which are certainly pre-Christian.<sup>245</sup> Here the Messiah is depicted to a quite striking extent by means of traits drawn from

<sup>242</sup>Also the possibility of a Christian partial interpolation is not taken into account by the best specialist, R. H. Charles (op. cit. in n. 240, p. LXIV, cf. 202). The Armenian translation of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* which we use is distinguished by its relative freedom from Christian interpolation; 'this is especially so in the last two Testaments' (those of Joseph and Benjamin), *ibid.*, XXVII.

<sup>243</sup>Cf. G. H. Dix 'The Messiah ben Joseph', *JTS*, 27, 1926, 136. The later material for the expectation of the dying Messiah b. Joseph in Dalman, I, 1-26; S.-B., II, 292-9. The circumstance that the text Zech. 12.10 ff. (cf. p. 74) which in rabbinic literature was related to Messiah b. Joseph is already messianically interpreted in the N.T. (n. 318), makes it very likely that this expectation reaches back to pre-Christian times. For a pre-Christian origin of this tradition the advocates are: E. King, *The Yalkut on Zechariah*, 1882, Appendix A: 'Messiah ben Joseph', 85-108; F. Delitzsch, *Der Messias als Versöhnner*, 1885, 20 f.; M. Friedmann, *Seder Eliabu rabba*, 1902, 'Introd.' p. 20 (Hebrew); G. H. Dix, loc. cit.; A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*,<sup>4</sup> 1930, 377, 467; J. Hering, *Le royaume de Dieu et sa venue*, 1937, 67, n. 1; Torrey, 'The Messiah', 253-77. Torrey is moreover convinced that the origin of a martyr Messiah b. Joseph is only to be understood on the basis of Isa. 53 (256, 258 f., 261), likewise Weber, 362; *Test. B.* 3.8 supports this hypothesis.

<sup>244</sup>The translation 'Visionary Discourses' has established itself and is therefore retained, but it is not exact. Ethiopian *mešal* (pl.), Hebrew לְשׁוֹנָה, Greek παραβολή refers to three apocalyptic visions—*Eth. En.* 37.5; 38.1; 45.1; 57.3; 58.1; 68.1; 69.29. Thus the word has here the meaning 'instructive speech with secret meaning'.

<sup>245</sup>The dating of the Discourses is dependent on the fact that they (56.5-7) make allusion to the Parthian invasion of Palestine of 40 B.C. They will have been composed shortly afterwards and a little later fitted into the scheme of *Enoch*. The untenability of the view that the discourses as a whole are Christian or have been provided in part with Christian interpolations has recently been demonstrated by Sjöberg, 3-24. The main argument is the total lack of anything specifically Christian.

## *The Servant of God in Late Judaism*

Deut. Isa. Apart from the titles 'son of man' and 'Messiah'<sup>246</sup> he bears constantly the name 'the chosen one'<sup>247</sup> but only occasionally that of 'the righteous one'.<sup>248</sup> 'The chosen one' is, however (Isa. 42.1), the title of the servant of God<sup>249</sup> and the same applies to 'the righteous one' (Isa. 53.11).<sup>250</sup> Thus we are led straight away to those two sections of Deut. Isa. which, also in the subsequent periods, are the ones interpreted messianically: Isa. 42.1 ff., 52.13 ff.<sup>251</sup>

In *En.* 48.4 the son of man is called 'the light of the peoples'; this is an attribute of God's servant (Isa. 42.6; 49.6). It is said further that his name was named before creation 'in the presence of the Lord of spirits' (*En.* 48.3); this is an amplification of Isa. 49.1: 'my name he named when I was not yet born'. Then he was 'hidden before God' (*En.* 48.6, cf. 62.7) which is a reference to Isa. 49.2 ('He hid me in the shadow of his hand').<sup>252</sup> Again, in the description of the revelation of the son of man the Visionary Discourses constantly depict the humiliation of kings and the mighty before him with a reminiscence of Isa. 49.7; 52.15.<sup>253</sup> It is said that they will see him in his glory (*En.* 55.4; 62.1, 3), rise before him (*En.* 46.4; 62.3), and cast themselves down (48.10 v.l.; 62.9; cf. 48.5), thus with an allusion to Isa. 49.7; 'Princes

<sup>246</sup>'The anointed': *En.* 48.10; 52.4.

<sup>247</sup>*En.* 39.6; 40.5; 45.3 (v.l.), 4; 49.2; 51.3, 5; 52.6, 9; 53.6; 55.4; 61.5, 8, 10; 62.1; cf. 46.3; 48.6; 49.4.

<sup>248</sup>*En.* 38.2 (v.l. 'righteousness', cf. Sjöberg, 96, n. 48); 47.1, 4; 53.6 ('the righteous and chosen one'). Cf. further 39.6: 'the elect of righteousness and faith'; 46.3: 'the son of man who has righteousness and with whom righteousness dwells'; 71.14.

<sup>249</sup>The allusion to Isa. 42.1 is generally recognized, and rightly. Cf. especially *En.* 49.4: 'He has been chosen by the Lord of spirits as the latter has willed' (for translation see Sjöberg, 122, n. 33) with Isa. 42.1: 'my chosen in whom my soul delighteth'. Ps. 89.3, 19 where David is called 'my chosen' (v. 3) and 'a chosen one' (v. 19) does not apply as an O.T. prototype, since late Judaism always related both verses to the historical David, never to the Messiah.

<sup>250</sup>The Messiah is called 'righteous' also in Zech. 9.9 (cf. 'righteous branch' Jer. 23.5; 33.15). In view of the many allusions to Deut. Isa., as far as *Eth. En.* is concerned only one is in question as a prototype, viz. Isa. 53.11. Cf. S.-B., I, 481.

<sup>251</sup>S.-B., I, 481: 'The messianic exegesis (of Isa. 53) is first (but see pp. 41, 57) seen in the Visionary Discourses of Enoch'; also cf. Wolff, 38 f.; Fischel, 61; lastly H. Kosmala, 'Jom Kippur', *Judaica*, 6, 1950, 16.

<sup>252</sup>Cf. with Isa. 49.2: 'in the shadow of his hand', *En.* 39.7: 'I saw his dwelling under the pinions of the Lord of Spirits'. The idea of the hiddenness of the Messiah plays a great part in subsequent periods even in the N.T. (cf. for example, Matt. 24.26; John 7.27; Rev. 12.5; further, Justin, *Dial.* 8, 110; Dalman, I, 34; and n. 457). The rich material still requires investigation.

<sup>253</sup>Cf. Billerbeck, 108; Fischel, 61.

and kings will see it and arise and cast themselves down'. It is said further that their countenance will be fallen (*En.* 46.6; 48.8) alluding to Isa. 52.15: 'Kings will shut their mouths before him'. In particular in *En.* 62.1 ff. the conduct of kings, the mighty and those who possess the earth, is depicted in close connexion with Isa. 52.13 ff.; thus *En.* 62.5 f.: 'They will be afraid (cf. Isa. 52.14), they will lower their eyes (cf. Isa. 52.15), and pain will seize them when they see the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory; kings (cf. Isa. 52.15), the mighty and all who possess the earth will glorify, praise and exalt him who rules over all (cf. Isa. 52.13), who was hidden (cf. Isa. 52.15)'.<sup>254</sup> Again it is the passages Isa. 42.1 ff.; 52.13 ff. (cf. p. 59) which are messianically interpreted; together with 49.1-2, 6-7. Finally there are the following statements which have a loose connexion with Deut. Isa. The chosen has the spirit of righteousness (*En.* 62.1 f; cf. [besides Isa. 11.2, 4] 42.1: 'My chosen . . . I have laid my spirit upon him'). He executes judgement (*En.* 41.9; 45.3; 49.4; 55.4; 61.9; 62.2 f.; 69.27; cf. Isa. 42.4 'A, Θ, Targ.). *En.* 48.4b: 'He will be the light of the peoples and the hope of the sad' combines Isa. 42.6 ('light of the peoples') with its context (42.7: salvation of the blind and wretched). The son of man of the Visionary Discourses is thus to a large extent<sup>255</sup> depicted with traits which are borrowed from servant passages of Deut. Isa. (42.1-7; 49.1 f., 6 f.; 52.13-15; 53.11).

This combination of son of man and servant of God, here brought about for the first time, was of decisive importance for Jesus' understanding of his mission.<sup>256</sup>

(δ) The next source which gives us information about the exegesis of 'ebed texts in late Judaism is the *Peshitta*; it is probably of pre-Christian origin.<sup>257</sup> *Peshitta* explains Isa. 53—includ-

<sup>254</sup>It is important to note for the comparison that Isa. 52.13 ff. in *Wisd.* 4.20 ff. (cf. p. 53) is also understood as a final judgement scene (which Sjöberg, 125, has overlooked).

<sup>255</sup>Billerbeck, 107: 'almost exclusively'. Cf. Staerk, *Soter*, 72-77, 82 f.

<sup>256</sup>Buber, 77. An echo of this combination of son of man and servant in *Ethiopian Enoch* is to be seen in the fact that in the *Heb. En.* the Metatron, who bears many attributes of the son of man (Odeberg, 146), is called שְׁבָעֵל (of God) or שְׁעִיל; see n.

<sup>194</sup>Cf. J. Bowman, 'The Background of the Term "Son of Man"', *ET*, 59, 1948, 288.

<sup>257</sup>P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 1947, 184, 186; also Hegermann, 22-27.

ing the passages about suffering—in a messianic sense.<sup>258</sup> This is clear from the passages where *Peshitta* discloses its understanding of Isa. 53 by deviations from the Heb. text. Thus *Peshitta* saw in the servant a figure awaited in the future (52.14) who shall 'cleanse' many peoples (52.15); this figure is denied (53.2), despised (53.3) and slain (53.5) but exalted by God and (at the last judgement) will convey forgiveness (53.5: healing). These statements can only refer to the Messiah.<sup>259</sup>

(ε) In one place the N.T. too gives us a piece of evidence for the messianic exegesis of a servant passage in late Judaism. According to Luke 23.35 the ἀρχοντες mock the Crucified with the words: ἀλλοις ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἐκλεκτός. For our purpose the point is that it is the Jewish ἀρχοντες who here describe the Messiah with the title ὁ ἐκλεκτός. Christian influence on this formulation is not probable, for as a christological formula ὁ ἐκλεκτός appears elsewhere in the N.T. only<sup>260</sup> in John 1.34.<sup>261</sup> But we are already acquainted with this title from the *Eth. En.* where, as we have seen, it appears as a pre-Christian Jewish messianic predicate derived from Isa. 42.1 (cf. p. 59).<sup>262</sup> Thus in Luke 23.35 we have an echo of the messianic

<sup>258</sup>Hegermann, 127.

<sup>259</sup>Hegermann, ibid.

<sup>260</sup>In Luke 9.35 we find the divergent form ὁ ἐκλεγμένος as the (probably original) reading. In the Apostolic Fathers and the apologists ὁ ἐκλεκτός is never used for 'Christ'.

<sup>261</sup>The fact that the reading ὁ ἐκλεκτός in John 1.34 offered by the oldest MSS., in spite of the small number of attestations (<sup>D<sup>5</sup></sup> K 77, 218 sy<sup>sc</sup> a b e ff<sup>2</sup>), represents the correct text, has been convincingly demonstrated by A. v. Harnack, 'Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes', *SAB*, 1915, 552–6 = 'Studien I, (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 19, 1931, 127–32). For in all three linguistic zones of the early church, Greek, Syrian, and Latin, textual history begins unanimously with this reading. In the fourth century, in the struggle against adoptionist christology, it was replaced by ὁ νίος.

<sup>262</sup>Otherwise as such it occurs plainly only in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 31.1. Perhaps there belongs here also the expression בְּחִירָה (of God) which is found in the *Habakkuk Commentary* in the recently discovered Palestinian texts (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, I, op. cit. in n. 69; see plate 57, col. 5, line 4; plate 59, col. 9, line 12), since there, just as in *Eth. En.* the plural form בְּחִירִים אֶל (10.13) also occurs along with it; yet a secure conclusion is not possible, for בְּחִירָה can be both singular and a defectively written plural. On the other hand *Test. B.* 11.4: καὶ ἐσται ἐκλεκτὸς θεοῦ ἔως τοῦ αἰώνος (cf. *TWNT*, IV, 190, 2 f.) certainly belongs to a Christian interpolation, as the state of the text itself shows (11.2b–5), and is related not to Christ but to the Benjamite Paul (Charles, op. cit. in n. 240, 215 f., note on ch. XI).

exegesis of Isa. 42.1 in late Judaism. Further let it be noted here, in confirmation of what we have been saying, that also in the N.T. the messianic interpretation of Deut. Isa. servant texts is limited to Isa. 42.1-4, 6; 49.6; 52.13-53.12 (cf. p. 93).

(ζ) At the beginning of the second century A.D.<sup>263</sup> Aquila completed in Palestine a new translation of the O.T. into Greek, designed to replace the LXX, as the latter offered Christians too much scope for the production of christological proof-texts.<sup>264</sup> Aquila's interpretation of the servant in Isa. 53 is to be inferred, *inter alia*, from his agreement with *Test. B.* 3.8 in the understanding of Isa. 53.5,<sup>265</sup> and from his exegesis of 53.9 as referring to the judgement which the servant holds; messianism is implicit at both points.<sup>266</sup> Further, Aquila translates (according to Jerome) υἱοῦ (Isa. 53.4) by ἀφημένον<sup>267</sup>

<sup>263</sup>The dating of the translation of the O.T. by Aquila is determined by the fact that he was, on the one hand, a pupil of R. Akiba (Jerome on Isa. 8.11 ff. [Migne, PL 24, 119 A]: 'Akibas quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumnavit'; *J. Qid.* I, 1 [59 a 9]), on the other hand of R. Eli'ezer ben Hyrcanos and of R. Jehoshua' ben Hananiah (*J. Meg.* I, 11 [71c 9]); the activity of the two last named reached its zenith c. A.D. 90. But R. Jehoshua' had served in the Temple as a Levite (*B. Ar.* 11b; *Siphre Num.* §116 on 18.3; *T. Sheq.* 2.14) and thus before the destruction of the Temple must have reached the canonical Levitic age of 20, and consequently must have been born before A.D. 50. R. Eli'ezer b. Hyrcanos was still older than R. Jehoshua', for he did not begin his studies until the age of 22 or 28 (*Pesiqta R. Eli'ezer* 1; *Gen. R.* 42.3 on 14.1; *Ab. R. Nat.* 6) and he pursued them many years under Rabban Jochanan b. Zakkai before A.D. 70. Thus he must have been born, say between A.D. 30 and A.D. 40 (J. Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 1930, 46; cf. R. T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1903, 142, n. 1; and according to Klausner, op. cit., 65, he was already at an advanced age c. A.D. 80). As far as the date of Eli'ezer's death is concerned, we know that he died before R. Akiba, hence before A.D. 135 (*B. Sanh.* 68a); for some time up to his death he was in banishment and was avoided by colleagues and pupils. Since Aquila read his translation both to him and to R. Jehoshua' (*J. Meg.* I, 11 [71c 9]) the latter could hardly have been produced after A.D. 110, and more likely earlier.

<sup>264</sup>*Septuaginta* (ed. A. Rahlf, 1935) I, p. vii f.

<sup>265</sup>Cf. n. 241.

<sup>266</sup>Cf. Hegermann 40, 42, 122 ff. for further observations, notably with regard to the agreement between Aquila and the *Targ.*

<sup>267</sup>Jerome (on Isa. 53.4 [Migne, PL 24, 507 A]) 'Pro eo quod Symmachus transtulit ἐν ἀρῆ ὄντα, hoc est in lepra, Aquila posuit ἀφημένον, id est leprorum; quod multi non intellegentes putant relictum (ἀφεμένον), et alii legunt καθήμενον, id est sedentem'. According to Eusebius (cf. Ziegler, 'Isaias' ad loc.) Aquila translated υἱοῦ by τετραυματισμένον.

But without question Jerome gives here the correct text (ἀφημένον); for the context of the reading, as conveyed by Eusebius, excludes its derivation from Aquila (cf. J. Ziegler, *Textkritische Notizen zu den jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Buches Isaias*—NGG, Fachgruppe V, N.F. I, 4, 1939, 97f.). Further Aquila consistently

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

(leprous, cf. *Vulgate*: *quasi leprosum*), a translation which is explained by the fact that the past participle of **עִוָּר** in post-biblical Hebrew (Pu'al) and Aramaic (Pa'el) has the meaning 'leprous'. For our question this translation is very illuminating because the exegesis 'leper' for Isa. 53.4 is met with also in rabbinic literature and is here referred to the Messiah.<sup>268</sup>

We are thinking of two places in *B. Sanh.* 98 which alone in the *Talmud*, along with a late *Midrash* text,<sup>269</sup> have preserved the curious conception of a leprous Messiah.<sup>270</sup> One text is *B. Sanh.* 98b, from *circa* A.D. 200.<sup>271</sup> In an enumeration of messianic titles it is here said 'And the teachers said "the leprous one", those of the House of Rabbi<sup>272</sup> said "the sick man" is his name, for it is written: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, but we thought him stricken with leprosy (**עִוָּר**), smitten and tormented by God"' (Isa. 53.4).<sup>273</sup> The other text is *B. Sanh.* 98a (alleged experience of R. Jehoshua' ben Levi, *circa* A.D. 250), where it is described how the Messiah sits outside the gates of Rome among the wretched people

---

renders the Heb. root **עִוָּר** by the Greek word group ἀφή/ἀπτεσθαι; and ἀφεσθαι is not attested in the whole of Greek literature and is clearly a newly coined passive form by Aquila. Such new formations, which suggest a brilliant mastery of Greek, and are made in the interest of the most literal translation of the Heb. text (cf. p. 52), are one of the typical signs of Aquila's translation (cf. the long list of Aquila's Hapax legomena in J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila*, 1916, 101–15).

<sup>268</sup>The supposition of Euler, 31 f., that Aquila is thinking of a leprous priest is wrong. Euler's remarks on Aquila suffer throughout from the fact that he has not recognized the translation technique of Aquila (see p. 52 and Hegermann, 15 f., 28–45).

<sup>269</sup>*Sepher Zerubbabel* (ed. A. Jellinek, *Bet-ha-Midr.*, II [1853/4], 54, 19 ff., cf. S.-B. II, 291). The comparison with *B. Sanh.* 98a shows that the 'wounds' from which men hide their faces are those of the leper.

<sup>270</sup>The essay of H. Gressmann, 'Der Aussätzige Messias' (*Die Christliche Welt*, 34, 1920, 663–68), contains nothing helpful to our investigation.

<sup>271</sup>This date results from the introductory formula רְבָנֵן אָמַרְיָה, cf. Dalman, I, 37; same date in S.-B., II, 286.

<sup>272</sup>Rabbi is R. Jehuda, I (135–c. 217).

<sup>273</sup>Thus the text which Raymundus Martini read (after A.D. 1278, *Pugio fidei*, ed. D. J. de Voisin, 1651, 672), cf. Dalman, I, 36, n. 2; rightly (cf. n. 309) followed by E. B. Pusey in *Driver-Neubauer*, II, p. XXXIV, and by North, 14. The present text of *B. Sanh.* 98b reads: 'And the teachers said: "the leper of the House of Rabbi" is he called, for it is written "Verily he . . ." ' (Isa. 53.4). Thus the text is interpreted messianically, but it is an obvious corruption; as a result of the omission of the word הַלְּבָדֶה (the sick man) arose the senseless messianic name: 'the leper of the House of Rabbi'.

who 'bear pain' (cf. Isa. 53.4),<sup>274</sup> and alone among them unbinds and binds just one wound at a time, so that without delay he may fulfil the summons to save Israel.

Aquila's translation of Isa. 53 permits us to trace back this reference of Isa. 53.4 to the leprous Messiah as far as A.D. 100.<sup>275</sup> But we must go back yet a step further; the messianic interpretation of Isa. 53.4 cannot have arisen first *circa* A.D. 100, for quite apart from the messianic exegesis of Isa. 53 in *Test. B.* (cf. p. 57) and *Peshitta* (cf. p. 60), it is completely out of the question that the Jews should have begun to interpret messianically the passion texts of Isa. 53 only at a time when Christians were already using Isa. 53 as the decisive christological proof text.<sup>276</sup>

(γ) The translation of Aquila was followed by that of Theodotion<sup>277</sup> in the second century A.D.<sup>278</sup> Theodotion too interpreted Isa. 53 in a messianic sense. This stands out most plainly from his translation of the concluding sentence of the chapter. Isa. 53 (M.T.) concludes with the words וְלִפְשָׁעִים יִפְגַּע or וְלִפְשָׁעֵיהֶם יִפְגַּע<sup>279</sup> (53.12). The verb means 'to have to do with a person', either *in bonam partem*—'to intercede'—or *in malam partem*—'to attack someone'. The Heb. text certainly had intended the first meaning, to judge by the context: 'and he

<sup>274</sup>Rashi explains these words as follows: 'who are smitten with leprosy, and he too is leprous, see Isa. 53.3, 4' (text, see Wünsche, 58, n. 2). Pointing to leprosy (so too Dalman, I, 39) are also the number of the wounds which must be bound up; but especially the sitting before the gates (see J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, II, A, 1924, 33, n. 1); the rule about walled towns being closed to lepers (S.-B., IV, 751-7) is transferred to Rome.

<sup>275</sup>That the leper exegesis of Isa. 53.4 attests the messianic understanding of the servant as early as the tannaitic period has been shown by H. J. Schoeps, 'Symmachusstudien III', *Biblica* 29, 1948, 38 f. = *Aus frührchristlicher Zeit*, 1950, 108 f.

<sup>276</sup>Franz Delitzsch, *Der Messias als Versöhnner*, 1885, 21; Schlatter, 50; Aytoun, 176; North, 11; cf. Riesenfeld, 84; Torrey, *JBL*, 66, 1947, 257.

<sup>277</sup>Until 1939 research had at its disposal only the collection of hexaplarist material by F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 1875. For Isaiah there has now appeared, in place of this work, the excellent hexaplarist apparatus which Ziegler, 'Isaias', offers. Ziegler was able on the basis of the MSS. to improve at many points the collection of Field, outstanding in its day, and, above all, to make use of the hexaplarist notices which are to be found (1) in the Isaiah commentary of Theodoret of Cyrus (ed. A. Möhle, 1933), (2) in an Isaiah commentary, supposedly of Chrysostom, which has come down to us in Armenian (pub. Venice, 1880) and (3) in the not yet edited Isaiah Commentary of Eusebius (preserved in the margin of the Florentine Codex, *Laurentianus Pluteus*, XI 4).

<sup>278</sup>According to Epiph. (*De mensuris et ponderibus* 17) under Commodus (180-92).

<sup>279</sup>Thus the newly discovered Isaiah roll (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, I, op. cit. in n. 69).

made intercession for the transgressors'. The following understand it correctly: the N.T. (Rom. 8.34; Heb. 7.25; I John 2.1 f.), Justin,<sup>280</sup> the *Vulgate*,<sup>281</sup> *Targum*,<sup>282</sup> *B. Talmud*,<sup>283</sup> also the very free rendering of the LXX (*καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη*) alluding to martyrdom has understood **עִזָּה בְּנֵי** *in bonam partem*. For the first time *Peshitta* understands the verb *in malam partem*,<sup>284</sup> as also does Aquila who translated, according to Pseud. Chrys. (n. 278): '*occurret irridentibus eum*', and Symmachus: *καὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν* (*contradicentibus* Pseud. Chrys.) *ἀντέστη* (*Cod.* 86) 'and he opposed those who rejected him'. In Theodotion this interpretation *in malam partem* continues; he translates '*et impios torquebit*' (Pseud. Chrys.). Thus with him the chapter concludes with the quite monstrous image of the servant torturing the godless. If we refuse to accept a crude error on the part of the Pseud. Chrys. text, which has unfortunately only been preserved in Armenian, we shall have to take as our point of departure the fact that LXX, 'A, and *Targ.* agree to regard Isa. 53.9 as a description of the last judgement,<sup>285</sup> and so by 'torture' Theodotion is thinking of eternal damnation.<sup>286</sup> The fact that he saw in the servant the ultimate judge shows that he interpreted Isa. 53 messianically.<sup>287</sup>

Since, unlike Aquila and Symmachus, Theodotion did not prepare a new translation, but took the LXX, also in use among the Christians, as his basis and ever and again improved it by reference to the original, it is to be expected that in some of his corrections he was influenced by the intention of excluding christological interpretations which the LXX made possible. The text already discussed (Isa. 53.12 e) arouses this suspicion. That Theodotion replaced the LXX text *καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη* is not surprising, since here the LXX had

<sup>280</sup> Justin, *Apol.* 50.2: *καὶ τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐξιλάσσεται* ('he will make atonement', *TWNT*, III, 315, 38).

<sup>281</sup> *Et pro transgressoribus rogavit.*

<sup>282</sup> 'And for his sake the rebellious will be forgiven'.

<sup>283</sup> *B. Sotah* 14a "He interceded for the transgressors" (Isa. 53.12): for he implored mercy for the transgressors of Israel that they might return in penitence; by this "intercession" is meant nothing other than prayer.'

<sup>284</sup> Cf. Hegermann, 107 f. on Isa. 53.12 *Peshitta*.

<sup>285</sup> Cf. Hegermann, 42, 86 f., 123 on Isa. 53.9 *Targ.*

<sup>286</sup> Hegermann 52 compares Isa. 66.24, Matt. 25.41, 46.

<sup>287</sup> Further observations in Hegermann, 113 f. Symmachus also gives the messianic interpretation.

translated very freely. But that Theodotion substituted for the statement of the LXX about the vicarious martyrdom of the servant a phrase which in its offensive harshness was not warranted by the Heb. text ('and he will torment the impious') might well be due to dislike of the Christian use of the LXX (cf. Rom. 4.25). Among the few fragments of the Theodotion translation of Isa. 53 his rendering of Isa. 53.12d: **אָתָה נִמְנַה פְּשֻׁעִים** 'and he was reckoned with the transgressors', is also very unusual. The LXX here translates καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἔλογισθη, but Theodotion: καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀπέσχετο (Cod. 86), 'and he kept aloof from the impious'. The striking feature here is that Theodotion has replaced a completely correct translation of the LXX by one which says exactly the opposite: the servant who is reckoned with the wicked (Heb., LXX, 'A, Σ) has become in Theodotion the servant who holds himself aloof from the wicked.<sup>288</sup> In this change again anti-Christian prejudice may have played a part. The text Isa. 53.12d was especially important for Christians (cf. Luke 22.37) because it did not refer in merely general terms to the suffering of the servant, but asserted that vicariously (53.12e) he was numbered with the criminals. More plainly than elsewhere in Isa. 53 they could find here a prophecy of the scandal of the cross. By reversing the meaning of the text Theodotion perhaps wished to make impossible the Christian interpretation.

(θ) The Aramaic translation of Isaiah must be considered here from a chronological point of view, although the *Targ.* on Isaiah<sup>289</sup> in its present form is not older than the fifth century A.D., for the text was fixed much earlier. The history of the oral tradition of translation, the result of which the *Targ.* represents,

<sup>288</sup>Hegermann, 51. R. Brinker-London put forward to the author the illuminating suggestion that Theodotion, instead of **נִמְנַה** ('he was counted') read **נִמְנַע** ('he held himself aloof').

<sup>289</sup>Editions: P. de Lagarde, *Prophetae Chaldaice*, 1872, from the *Codex Reuchlini*; with apparatus: Stenning, 1949. The section Isa. 52.13–53.12 has been published by G. Dalman in *Aramäische Dialektproben*, 1927, 10 f. The very meritorious work of Seidelin comes to debatable results because the distinction between the Jewish-Hellenistic and the Jewish-Palestinian exegesis of Isa. 42 and 53 is not recognized and in the evaluation of rabbinic material no distinction is made between allusions to and interpretations of Isa. 53. Besides that, the age of the rabbinic interpretations of Isa. 53.4 has not been realized, and the meaning of the anti-Christian polemic under-valued.

goes back to pre-Christian times.<sup>290</sup> In particular it can be shown that the messianic exegesis of the servant texts Isa. 42.1 and Isa. 52.13 in the *Targ.* Isa. is old. Of the nineteen servant passages in the Heb. text (cf. p. 50) only three are messianically interpreted in the *Targ.* Isa.: 42.1; 43.10; 52.13;<sup>291</sup> in all three texts the Heb. עָבֵד־מֶשְׁיחָא is rendered by the *Targ.*<sup>292</sup> Our conclusions so far make it certain that the messianic interpretation of Isa. 42.1 and 52.13 rests upon ancient tradition (cf. pp. 57 ff.).<sup>293</sup> The observation that the description of the Messiah

<sup>290</sup>A specially clear example of the great age of the tradition of translation reached in the *Targ.* is furnished by Isa. 6.10. The Heb. text runs: וְרַפֵּא לֹא and the LXX: καὶ οὐ σωμαῖ αὐτούς, Σ: καὶ οὐθὲν. Quite otherwise is the translation of *Targ.*: רִשְׁתְּבִיק לְהַזְּנוּ ‘and they shall be forgiven’. (רַפֵּא (to heal) is mistaken for רַפֵּה (to remit); see Schlatter, *Mark*, on 4.12. This understanding of the text is very ancient; for it is already to be found in syrpal: וְנִשְׁתַּבְקֵה for and *Mark* 4.12: καὶ ὀφεθῆ αὐτοῖς (cf. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1948, 77 and *TWNT*, V, 555, n. 116). With regard to Isa. 53 in particular, in many instances the age of the synagogue tradition of translation crystallized in the *Targ.* can be shown by means of the LXX, the *Peshitta*, 'A, Σ, and Θ. A few examples may be mentioned: (i) Isa. 52.13: for the age of the expression עָבֵד־מֶשְׁיחָא cf. p. 50. (ii) Isa. 53.3b is interpreted in the *Targ.* (otherwise in the Heb. text and the LXX) with reference to the turning away of the shekina, as also in 'A. (iii) Isa. 53.4: for חֲלֹזֶן ‘our infirmities’ the *Targ.* says חֻבְּנָא; likewise the LXX ἄμαρτίας ἡμῶν. (iv) Isa. 53.5: מִחְלָל is on the part of the LXX derived from חַלֵּל Po'al ‘to pierce’: ἐτραυμάτισθη; the *Targ.* on the contrary derives it from חַלֵּל Pu'al ‘to be dishonoured’: אִינְתְּהַל ‘he was profaned’ as also already in *Test. B.* 3.8 (see n. 241) and 'A: βεβηλωμένος. (v) Isa. 53.7: גַּשׁ is derived by the LXX and Itala from שָׁגַּשׁ ‘he was abused’, but the *Targ.* derives it from גַּשֵּׁשׁ ‘he approached’, as already in Σ and the *Vulgate*. (vi) Isa. 53.9: application to the judgement found in the *Targ.* is already in the LXX, 'A, and Θ (cf. p. 65). (vii) Isa. 53.10: the LXX translates אֶלְכָּא by καθαρίσαι, as does the *Targ.*: מְצַרֵּךְ (see Hegermann, 122–5).

<sup>291</sup>Of the remaining sixteen texts the *Targ.* refers (i) to Israel 41.8, 9; 44.1, 2, 21 (twice); 45.4; 48.20; 49.3; and probably also 49.5, 6 (see n. 214); (ii) to penitent sinners (see n. 219) 42.19 (twice); (iii) to the prophets (see n. 220) 50.10; (iv) 44.26 the Heb. text was perhaps read by the *Targ.* as a plural (see n. 221); (v) 53.11 (Heb. עָבֵד־י) in the *Targ.* is an infinitive: ‘in order to make servants of the law’.

<sup>292</sup>Textual uncertainty exists only with regard to *Targ.* Isa. 42.1. עָבֵד־מֶשְׁיחָא is read in the *Codex Reuchlini* (see n. 289), the *Codex Nitrenberg* (see Stenning, XXIX) and the Wilna edition, 1893. But the *Codex Orientalis*, 2211 (British Museum) and others have simply עָבֵד. Yet the reading עָבֵד־מֶשְׁיחָא is supported by the fact that the whole Palestinian tradition—as distinct from the Hellenistic (see pp. 52 f.)—from before the Christian era onwards, interprets Isa. 42.1 ff. messianically (see p. 75).

<sup>293</sup>The messianic interpretation of Isa. 43.10, which perhaps is occasioned by Heb. עָבֵד, in the mouth of God, as in 42.1; 52.13 (Seidelin, 228), has on the contrary

as servant of God is to be found only in the pre-rabbinic layer of late Jewish literature (II Esd. [IV Ezra], *Syr. Bar.*, cf. p. 49) but nowhere in rabbinic literature outside the *Targ.* (cf. p. 50), points to the same conclusion. Above all, the ancient date of the messianic exegesis of Isa. 52.13 in the *Targ.* is clear from the fact that *Targ. Isa.* explains the whole context Isa. 52.13–53.12 uniformly in a messianic sense; for the messianic interpretation of 53.1–12 cannot, as we saw (p. 64), have first arisen in the Christian era.

The *Targ. Isa.* 52.13–53.12 runs: (52.13) ‘Behold my servant, the Messiah, will have success, will become exalted, great and strong.’ (14) ‘As the house of Israel have hoped in him many days when their appearance was overcast in the midst of the peoples and their brightness less than that of the sons of men;’ (15) ‘so will he scatter many peoples; for his sake kings will be silent, will lay their hand on their mouth; for they see what they had never been told and perceive what they had never heard of.’ (53.1) ‘Who hath believed this our message? and to whom hath the strength of the mighty arm of the Lord thus<sup>294</sup> been revealed?’ (2) ‘And the righteous<sup>295</sup> shall be great before him, yea, as sprouting branches and as a tree which sends out its roots beside water brooks, so will the holy generations increase in the land which was in need of him. His appearance is not like that of worldly things and the fear which he inspires is not an ordinary fear, but his brightness will be holy so that all who see him will gaze (fascinated) upon him.’ (3) ‘Then (he) will be despised and will (make to) cease the glory of all

---

no parallel in other late Jewish literature; *Midr. Ps.* 51 §3 on 51.6 refers Isa. 43.10 to David. But Jerome says on Isa. 43.1–10 that the Jews had interpreted the section *de secundo Salvatoris adventu, quando post plenitudinem gentium omnis salvandus sit Israel* (cf. Seidelin, 222, n. 79).

<sup>294</sup> כָּדֵן; ed. Venice 1517: כָּדֵן (now), probably scribal error.

<sup>295</sup> צַדִּיקִים (plural); on the other hand *Codex Reuchlini* (n. 289, *Biblia Hebraica Rabbinica*, ed. J. Buxtorf the elder, 1618–19) and the Arab. ed. of the *Targ. Jonathan* I (1196 A.D.; see Dalman, I, 48, n. 1) read the singular: נֶצֶדְקָה. The singular is supported by the striking singular of the immediately preceding verb: וַיַּתְרַבֵּא. It could refer to the Messiah (cf. the messianic explanation of our text by R. Berechiah (*circa* 340) which seems to have been removed from talmudic literature, n. 313). Probably, however, a collective singular was intended, so that between the better attested plural and the singular reading there is no difference of meaning.

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

kingdoms.<sup>296</sup> They will become weak and pitiable—behold, like a man of sorrows and as one destined to ills and as if the *shekina* had turned its face from us—despised and disregarded'. (4) 'Then he will make intercession for our transgressions and for his sake our iniquities shall be forgiven, though we were accounted bruised, smitten by Yahweh and afflicted.' (5) 'But he will build up the sanctuary which was desecrated because of our transgressions and surrendered because of our iniquities, and by his teaching his peace<sup>297</sup> will be richly upon us, and when we gather to listen to him our transgressions will be forgiven us.' (6) 'We were all scattered as sheep, each one had gone his own way into exile; but it was Yahweh's will to forgive the transgressions of us all for his sake.' (7) 'When he prays he receives an answer and hardly does he open his mouth, but he finds a hearing. He will deliver the strong from among the peoples to be slaughtered as a lamb, and as a ewe that is dumb before its shearers, and no one will (dare) to open his mouth and plead.' (8) 'He will bring our exiles home from their suffering and chastisement. Who can tell the wonders which will come upon us in his days? For he will remove the dominion<sup>298</sup> of the peoples from the land of Israel; he will lay

<sup>296</sup>The textual question to be discussed here is of great importance. There are two alternative readings, which though hardly distinguishable in writing are, in fact, very different. (1) *Codex Orientalis* 2211 (British Museum) and the bulk of the MSS., as also the Wilna edition (1893) read: יִפְסִיק Aph'el: 'he will make to cease'. (2) But *Codex Orientalis* 1474 (British Museum) reads: יִפְסֹוק Qal: 'it will cease'. *Codex Reuchlini* יִפְסָק is ambiguous on account of the missing *mater lectionis*. The two versions presuppose a different subject; in the first (reading: יִפְסִיק) the Messiah is the subject and the translation is: 'Then he (the Messiah) will be despised and will make to cease the glory of all kingdoms' (for this reading see Wünsche, 41; Humbert, 445, 38, n.1; S-B., I, 482; II, 284; Kittel, 179; Briere-Narbonne, 99; North, 12). In the second case (reading: יִפְסָק) 'the honour of all kingdoms' is the subject, and the translation is: 'As a result the honour of all kingdoms will end and will turn to shame' (for this reading see Dalman, op. cit. in n. 289, 10, n. 18; Seidelin, 207, 211 f.). Without question the textual evidence points predominantly to the first reading (יִפְסִיק): the weakly attested second reading (יִפְסָק) stands moreover under the suspicion of wishing to set aside the suffering of the Messiah. Thus in *Targ. Isa.* 53.3 we have, in all probability, the statement: 'then will he be despised', a trace of the idea of messianic suffering.

<sup>297</sup> שֶׁלְמִיחָה; *Codex Reuchlini* (see n. 289), *Codex Nuremberg* (cf. n. 292) and the Venice edition (1517) read שֶׁלְמָא without suffix.

<sup>298</sup> שׁוֹלֵם can also mean 'ruler'.

to their charge<sup>299</sup> the sins of which my people were guilty.' (9) 'And he will deliver over to hell the godless and those who have enriched themselves by robbery unto the death of (eternal) destruction, so that they who commit sin may not be preserved and may no longer speak cunningly with their mouth.' (10) 'And it pleases Yahweh to refine and purify the remnant of his people in order to cleanse their soul from transgressions. They shall see the kingdom of their Messiah; they will have many sons and daughters;<sup>300</sup> they will live long, and those who fulfil the law of Yahweh will by his good pleasure have success.' (11) 'From subjugation by the peoples he will deliver their soul; they will see the punishment of them that hate them; they will be satiated by the plunder of their kings. By his wisdom he will acquit the innocent to make many servants of the law. And he will make intercession for their transgressions.' (12) 'Hereafter will I apportion to him the plunder of many peoples and he will distribute strong towns as booty, because he surrendered<sup>301</sup> himself to death and brought the rebels under the yoke of the law. And he will make intercession for many transgressions and for his sake the rebellious will be forgiven.'

It can be seen how, step by step, in *Targ.* Isa. 52.13–53.12 is depicted the glorious establishment of the messianic kingdom over Israel. The statements about the passion of the servant have been so radically and consistently removed by artificial contrivances that faint traces remain only in two places.<sup>302</sup> Even allow-

<sup>299</sup> יְמִתֵּר is to be read with Dalman (see n. 289) 11, n. 6 as Aph'el = יְמִתֵּר (*Codex Orientalis* 2211 [British Museum]: יְמִתֵּר).

<sup>300</sup> יְסָגֹן is with Dalman (see n. 289) 11, n. 9 to be read as Aph'el = יְסָגֹן (*Codex Orientalis* 2211 [British Museum]: יְסָגֹן).

<sup>301</sup> As Dalman has shown, I, 48, n. 3, it is not necessarily implied that this statement relates to accomplished execution; involvement in the peril of death might also be meant (thus also S.-B., I, 482 f.: Seidelin, 215, n. 62). The text does not state on what occasion the 'surrender to death' ensued. The allusion might be to the war which precedes the messianic time (thus Weber, 361; Seidelin, 215), or rather, according to the original text, to death (or danger of death) from ill-treatment. (Cf. Isa. 53.7 f.).

<sup>302</sup> Two texts are in question: (i) *Targ.* Isa. 53.3: 'he will become despised', see n. 296; (ii) *Targ.* Isa. 53.12: 'he delivered his soul over to death', מסר למוותא נפשיה, see n. 301; and Humbert, 5; Bonsirven, 383; Fischel, 70.

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

ing for the targumic translation technique, the section *Targ.* Isa. 52.13–53.12 stands out by the unusual freedom of its paraphrase in the context of *Targ.* Isa. 40–66,<sup>303</sup> which elsewhere keeps more closely to the Heb. text. For this violent reinterpretation of the text there is only one possible explanation: we have here a piece of anti-Christian polemic.<sup>304</sup> From the second century at the latest, Judaism was concerned in various ways to wrest Isa. 53 from its use by Christians as a christological scriptural text proof (cf. p. 75). The curious form of Isa. 53 in the *Targ.* shows to what extremes this attempt was carried through. The whole section was indeed messianically explained because the messianic interpretation of Isa. 52.13–53.12 was so firmly rooted that *Targ.* Isa. could not escape it, but the passages about suffering, in brusque contradiction to the original, are replaced by the current view of the Messiah. The fact that this thoroughgoing process of reinterpretation of Isa. 52.13–53.12 was applied to both the Greek (see pp. 65 ff.) and the Aramaic texts of Isa. 53 shows how firmly rooted in Palestinian Judaism was the messianic exegesis.

(1) On the part of the Rabbis, likewise, only two Deut. Isa. servant passages have been understood in a messianic sense: Isa. 42.1 ff. and Isa. 52.13 ff.<sup>305</sup> These are in fact the two passages which, so far, we have constantly found to be interpreted messianically. As for Isa. 42.1 ff., it is essential to note that only the messianic interpretation<sup>306</sup> is found in rabbinic literature. The messianic

<sup>303</sup>Cf. Aytoun, 172.

<sup>304</sup>This is generally admitted. Even Dalman, who had tried to escape this conclusion (I, 43–49) was forced to grant it later; G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, 1929, 172. The tendentious overworking is plainly distinguishable against an older version of the text—Hegermann, 116–122. In the following period the Jewish exegesis of Isa. 53 remains understandably determined by the opposition to the Christian interpretation (see Fischel, 66 f.).

<sup>305</sup>Whether Isa. 49.6 is to be quoted as a third instance is extremely doubtful. It is true that Raymundus Martini, op. cit. (see n. 273), 645, read a messianic interpretation of Isa. 49.6 in *Gen. maior* on 41.44 (Dalman, I, 97, n. 1); further in the post-talmudic period, in *Pesiqt. R.* 31 (cf. Seidelin, 218; Fischel, 62) Isa. 49.8 is once given a messianic interpretation. In this occasional messianic exegesis of the servant of Isa. 49.6 there might, in view of *Eccl. 48.10* (see p. 57), the Visionary Discourses *Eth. En.* (p. 59) and of the N.T. (n. 403), be an echo of an older tradition. But that is not certain. In any case, the *Targ.* does not explain Isa. 49.6 messianically (see n. 214) and we have no other evidence for the rabbinic explanation of Isa. 49.6, apart from the two late texts mentioned.

<sup>306</sup>*Midr. Ps.* 2 §9 on 2.7 (S.-B., I, 483); 43 §1 on 43.3 (S.-B., I, 87); *Pesiqt. R.* 36 (S.-B., II, 288); *Yalqut Shim'onai*, II, 88d, 104d (Dalman, I, 97, n. 1); *Seder Gan 'Eden* (ed. A. Jellinek, *Bet-ha-Midrasch*, III, 1885, 133.12). Also *Targ.* Isa. ad loc. (see p. 67).

interpretation of Isa. 52.13–53.12 by the Rabbis<sup>307</sup> concerns both the passages of exaltation and the passages about suffering.<sup>308</sup> In particular the reference of the passages about suffering in Isa. 53 to the Messiah emerges very early with the Rabbis, and simultaneously at several points.

Unfortunately one testimony is textually uncertain. Raymundus Martini (*post* 1278)<sup>309</sup> read in *Siphre Lev.* an utterance of R. Jose the Galilaean (*ante* A.D. 135), interpreting Isa. 53.5 as referring to the suffering and sorrowing King-Messiah who, by his pains, justifies all peoples. In our *Siphre Lev.* texts only the context is given (*Siphre Lev.* יְקָרָא 12.10 on 5.17),<sup>310</sup> while the two phrases pointing to the Messiah and to Isa. 53 are missing.<sup>311</sup> Have we to do with an interpolation?<sup>312</sup> In view of the sharpness with which Judaism opposed the Christian exegesis of the passages about suffering in Isa. 53 (cf. p. 75) we must reckon with the possibility of a textual curtailment, especially as elsewhere messianic exegesis of Isa. 53 seems to have been excised.<sup>313</sup> This assumption gains a high degree of probability

<sup>307</sup>A choice of rabbinic texts in S.-B., I, 481–3; further 50 f.

<sup>308</sup>Rabbinic applications to the Messiah of the exaltation passages of Isa. 52.13 ff.: *Targ.* Isa. here (see p. 68); *Tanch.* חַוְלָדִת §20 (70a, Buber); *Midr.Ps.* 2 §9 on 2.7. Further examples and parallels, cf. Wünsche, 76; Dalman, I, 84, n. 3; S.-B., I, 483. Cf. Moore, III, 166.

<sup>309</sup>Op. cit. (see n. 273), cf. Dalman, I, 79 f. 44, n. 2; for text cf. Wünsche, 65 f.; Driver-Neubauer, II, 10 f. About the credibility of Raymundus Martini cf. L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt*, 1892, 301; H. L. Strack, article on 'Raimundus Martin', in *RE*<sup>3</sup>, 16, 414 f. About the value of his traditions, which has been brilliantly confirmed by a textual discovery in Prague, see Dalman, II, 6, and cf. n. 273; Driver-Neubauer, XXV–XXXV; L. Zunz, *ibid.*, 300–5; Strack, *Einl.*, 223 f. (Lit.).

<sup>310</sup>First edition, Venice, 1545, 15b; ed. Weiss, 1862, 27a.

<sup>311</sup>The context discusses the fact that Adam's transgression caused countless sentences of death and puts the question: 'What measure is the greater, that of mercy or that of punitive justice? Answer: the measure of goodness is the greater (here begins the addition of Raymundus Martini) and that of punitive justice is the smaller. How much more then will the king, the Messiah, who suffers and is in agony for the godless, justify all mankind, as it is written: "But he was wounded for our transgressions" (Isa. 53.5). The same is meant by Isa. 53.6: "But the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all".'

<sup>312</sup>Thus Dalman, I, 43, 81.

<sup>313</sup>Justin already reproaches the Judaic teachers with the fact that they completely eliminated from the LXX many texts (πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλεον περιεῖλον) which pointed to the Crucified (*Dial.* 71.2); of the four examples which he names (72.1–73.6, cf. 120.5) three are obviously Christian interpolations. In any case the quick replacement of the LXX by the translation of Aquila (see n. 202) shows that in fact already in the second century A.D. the removal of undesired texts was one of the

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

from the fact that similar statements have come down to us from a scholar closely connected with R. Jose, likewise a pupil of R. Akiba and, together with R. Jose, a teacher in Jabne and then in Lydda: R. Tarphon (Tryphon).<sup>314</sup> Justin reports in the *Dial.* that Tryphon several times granted him that the Messiah was παθητός: (36.1; 39.7; 49.2; 68.9; 76.6–77.1; 89.1–2, cf. especially 90.1: παθεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἀχθῆσεσθαι [= Isa. 53.7] οὔδαμεν).<sup>315</sup> Certainly we must be on our guard against the statements of an apologist. On the other hand it speaks for the credibility of Justin that in his arguments with Tryphon Isa. 53 especially is in question,<sup>316</sup> which presupposes a common point of departure; and, further, Justin carefully distinguishes between passages and readings which his opponents recognize and those which they do not, and emphasizes that he builds up his

---

weapons of Jewish anti-Christian polemic. As regards Isa. 53, in particular, ‘the single application in *Sanh.* 98b of Isa. 53 to the suffering Messiah’ proves that we have to reckon with textual abbreviations (Strack, *Einl.*, 79). This conclusion is supported by the report of mediaeval sources (Ibn Ezra, died 1167 or 1168; according to Dalman, I, 40, n. 2, also **מלחמת מצוה**, composed 1240) that the section beginning with Isa. 52.13 in *Sotab* I was referred to the Messiah. In our texts of *B. Sotah* this exegesis is not found. Rashi too (died 1105) did not find the messianic exegesis of Isa. 52.13 ff. (apart from 53.4, cf. n. 274) in the *Talmud*, rather, as he expressly says, he only knew of it from hearsay (‘Commentary on Isa. 53’, text in Wünsche, 94). Further, it is striking that a messianic exegesis of Isa. 53.2 on the part of R. Berechiah, living *circa* A.D. 340 (S.-B., I, 49 f.), has been preserved only through the Christian Raymundus Martini writing about one thousand years later, after A.D. 1278 (op. cit. in n. 273, 594), while in the older sources no trace of it is to be found. The trustworthiness of the information that R. Berechiah explained Isa. 53.2 messianically is supported by the fact that this scholar expounded the doctrine of the suffering of the Messiah (S.-B., II, 285 f.; cf. I, 86 f.). Finally a messianic exegesis of Isa. 53.3, reported by Moshe-ha-darshan (in the first half of the eleventh century) in his work *Gen. R. maior* on 24. 67 (text, Dalman, II, 6 f. after A. Epstein; Wünsche, 69 after Raymundus Martini, op. cit. in n. 273, 671; cf. Dalman, I, 79) is the only citation of Raymundus from *Gen. R. maior*, for which the source is not to be found in the older literature (Dalman, I, 80 f.).

<sup>314</sup>The identity of R. Tarphon and Justin’s Tryphon, presupposed in the text, is also asserted by H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*<sup>2</sup>, IV, 1865, 63 f.; Schürer, II, 444, n. 138 (older literature also quoted here); P. Fiebig, article on ‘Tarphon’ in *RGG*<sup>2</sup>, V, 997 f.; B. Altaner, *Patrologie*, 1938, 64; doubts about this identity are raised by S. Krauss, ‘The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers’, *JQR*, 5, 1893, 125 f.; A. Schlatter, ‘Die Tage Trajans und Hadrians’, *BFT*, 1, 1897, 97 f.; M. Freimann in *MGWJ*, N.S. 19, 1911, 567 ff.; Strack, *Einl.*, 126 n. 1.

<sup>315</sup>It is completely out of the question to think of gracious concessions on the part of Tryphon (thus A. H. Guignebert, *Le monde juif vers le temps de Jésus*, 1939, 148, n. 1; on the other hand Davies, 281) in view of what we know about his learning (Bacher, *Tannaiten*, I, 342–52) and his hostile attitude towards Jewish Christians (*B. Shab.* 116a).

<sup>316</sup>Twenty-seven quotations in the *Dial.*

## The Servant of God

christological proof only on the former (Just. *Dial.* 71.2 f., 120.5).

The next quotation comes from *circa* A.D. 200 (cf. n. 271). It is the description of the Messiah as 'the leper' and 'the sick man', on the basis of Isa. 53.4 in *B. Sanh.* 98b (cf. p. 63). The idea that the servant is described as a leper, Isa. 53.4, we first met with in Aquila (cf. pp. 62 f.). Aquila was a pupil of R. Akiba (see n. 263). It can hardly have been an accident that both R. Jose and R. Tarphon, who likewise referred Isa. 53 to the suffering Messiah (cf. pp. 72 f.), were also pupils of Akiba. This coincidence gains increased significance from the fact that R. Akiba himself taught a suffering of the Messiah<sup>317</sup> and that R. Dosa (*circa* A.D. 180), who for the first time in rabbinic literature explains Zech. 12.12 with reference to the slaying of the Messiah b. Joseph,<sup>318</sup> was a disciple with Akiba's pupil Jehuda b. El'ai.<sup>319</sup> R. Akiba, the most influential biblical scholar of the first two centuries A.D., lived *circa* A.D. 50–135.<sup>320</sup> It was his school, represented by R. Tarphon (*circa* A.D. 60–140), R. Jose the Galilean and Aquila (both working *circa* A.D. 100) which, above all, preserved and developed the tradition of the messianic exegesis of the passages about suffering in Isa. 53.

In the third century R. Jochanan (*circa* A.D. 200–279),<sup>321</sup> and in the fourth R. Acha (*circa* A.D. 320),<sup>322</sup> applied Isa. 53.5: 'He was wounded for our transgressions', to the sorrows of the

<sup>317</sup>S.-B., II, 284. Akiba concluded from the typology of Mosaic time and messianic time that the latter would involve a forty-year period of distress in the desert, and supported his point by reference to Job 30.4 (*Tanh:* בְּקֻעַ, ed. Vienna 1863, 7b; *TWNT*, IV, 865, 3 ff.).

<sup>318</sup>B. *Sukka* 52a. The casual way of mentioning Messiah b. Joseph and his death shows that we have here a well-known idea (Moore, II, 370; see n. 243). The messianic exegesis of Zech. 12.10 ff. is old: John 19.37; Rev. 1.7, cf. Matt. 24.30; *Targ.* (S.-B., II, 583 f.); *Midr.* (S.-B., II, 298 f.). It is possible that it goes back to the original text (see *TWNT*, III, 848.16 ff.; Torrey, *JBL*, 66, 1947, 253–77).

<sup>319</sup>Bacher, *Tannaiten*, II, 1890, 389; Strack, *Einl.*, 131. It should further be mentioned that two of Akiba's pupils, R. Jehuda and R. Nehemiah (both *circa* A.D. 150) took part in the oldest rabbinic discussion about Messiah b. Joseph (*Gen. R.* 75 on 32.6).

<sup>320</sup>P. Benoit, 'Rabbi Aquiba ben Joseph, Sage et héros du Judaïsme' in *RB* 54, 1947, 56.

<sup>321</sup>Ruth R. 5 on 2.14 (H. L. Strack, 'Zur altjudischen Theologie', *TB*, 2, 1881, 10 f.; S.-B., I, 27; II, 285). As the name of the author we should read with *Yalqut Shim'on* ad loc. 603 R. Jochanan instead of R. Jonathan (S.-B., I, 27; II 285; I, 312). cf. Fischel, 62; the correct reading can be found already in Bacher, op. cit. in n. 236, 312.

<sup>322</sup>*Midr. Sam.* 19 §1 (S.-B., II, 287). Cf. Dalman, I, 52, n. 1 for the v.l. citing R. Idi (*circa* A.D. 250) as author.

## The Servant of God in Late Judaism

Messiah. R. Berechiah (*circa A.D. 340*) follows with the messianic explanation of Isa. 53.2.<sup>323</sup> In the post-talmudic period examples multiply,<sup>324</sup> yet on the whole are not numerous. This fact is to be explained by the contradiction between such a conception of the Messiah and the customary one, but especially by the opposition to Christianity.

(x) From the second century A.D. the history of Jewish exegesis of Isa. 53 is shaped increasingly by the opposition to Christianity.<sup>325</sup> This process begins by the avoidance of the description of the Messiah as 'servant of God' and 'the chosen', which the pseudepigraphic writers had used without embarrassment (cf. p. 50 and n. 262), and also of the title 'son of man',<sup>326</sup> and 'Jesus', which had become a *nomen odiosum* (cf. TWNT, III, 287, 20 ff.). From the end of the second century the apologetic method of changing the text<sup>327</sup> and of tendentious interpretation was seized upon in translating Isa. 53, in order to dispose of passages which were of use to Christians in their text proofs. This polemical method is used especially in *Targ. Isa. 53* (cf. pp. 66 ff.). A similar mode of apologetic is used by R. Simlai (*circa A.D. 250*), who applies Isa. 53.12 to Moses (see n. 329). As far as possible, however, Isa. 42.1 ff. and 53 are not used at all.<sup>328</sup> Indeed, it seems that messianic interpretations

<sup>323</sup>S.-B., I, 50 f., cf. n. 313.

<sup>324</sup>Dalman, I, 53–84, cf. Dalman, II, 3–19 and the comprehensive collection of texts of Brieire-Narbonne, but from the point of view of material not going further than Dalman. We must draw attention to the great description of messianic suffering in *Pesiq. R. 34–37* which, according to B. J. Bamberger, 'A Messianic Document of the 7th Century', *HUCA*, 15, 1940, 425–43, took shape in Palestine in the years 632–7 and was based upon considerably older material. Isa. 53, it is true, is explicitly quoted only in the form of the text to be found in *Gen. R. maior* of R. Moshe-hadarshan, (see Wünsche, 79, n. 1 after Raymundus Martini, op. cit. in n. 273, 664), but the statements about the vicarious punishment of the Messiah in *Pesiq. R. 34–37* rest upon the ideas expressed in Isa. 53 (cf. Dalman, I, 67) as is shown especially by the allusion to Isa. 53.11 in *Pesiq. R. 37* (Moore, I, 552 n. 1).

<sup>325</sup>The rich material concerning the anti-Christian apologetic and polemic of Judaism in the first centuries has not yet been exhaustively dealt with.

<sup>326</sup>As distinct from *Eth. En.* it is lacking in *Slav.* and *Heb. En.* and in the whole of rabbinic literature (S.-B., I, 959; there is also the apparent exception *J. Taan. 2*, 1 [65b], 60).

<sup>327</sup>For an example of the change in the Greek text see p. 65 and for an example of the change of the Aramaic text see n. 296; by the change of פָּטִים (Targ. Isa. 53.3) into קָרְבָּן, a statement about suffering is transformed into one about glory.

<sup>328</sup>Fischel, 66, n. 67: 'Probably the not very frequent use of 42.1 ff.; 50.4 ff., and 52.13 ff. in the *Midrash* is occasioned by the great significance of these texts in Christian exegesis.'

of Isa. 53 were excised whenever occasion served; in several instances there is at least a suspicion of this sort (cf. n. 313). These observations are very important for our judgement of late Jewish exegesis of Isa. 53. The widespread conclusion, that the relative infrequency of messianic interpretations of Isa. 53 in late Judaism shows that the latter was not acquainted with the idea of the suffering Messiah, does not do justice to the sources; for it ignores the great part which—very understandably—the debate with Christianity played in this question.

The slender amount of evidence is counterbalanced by the fact that there is not to be found a definitely non-messianic exegesis of Isa. 53 in the rabbinic literature of the first millennium A.D.<sup>329</sup> This is especially striking when we examine rabbinic statements about the atoning power of death. This idea gains ground extraordinarily in late Judaism. The execution has atoning effect if the criminal has made the expiatory vow ('May my death expiate all my sins', see n. 475); every dying person is entreated to say this expiatory vow. Furthermore, late Judaism from pre-Christian times realizes the vicarious expiatory power inherent in the death of the high priest, of martyrs, of the righteous, of the patriarchs, of innocent children. It is astonishing that in this rich material there is no reference to Isa. 53.<sup>330</sup> Of this there is only one possible explanation: the connexion of Isa. 53 with the Messiah was from pre-Christian days so firmly and exclusively held by Palestinian Judaism that the application of this chapter to the expiatory death of the righteous was automatically excluded from consideration.<sup>331</sup>

<sup>329</sup>It is very questionable whether in Palestinian Judaism of the first millennium there existed any other exegesis of Isa. 53 except the messianic one (unlike Hellenistic Judaism; cf. p. 53), if one leaves out of account *B. Sotah*, 14a, where Isa. 53.12 is referred by R. Simlai (*circa* 250) to Moses' intercession; for here it is a question of a distortion for apologetic motives (see pp. 56 f.). The passages collected by S.-B. in 'Isa. 53 in the Older Literature' (I, 481–5), under the heading *B. Allusions to the Righteous* (I, 483, 485), are references to isolated texts torn from their context (see pp. 54 f., 65). The one Midrash text quoted by S.-B. under 'C. Allusions to the people of Israel' (I, 485), *Num. R.*, 13 on 13.2 (anonymous), comes from a *Midrash* composed in the twelfth century.

<sup>330</sup>The sole exception, R. Simlai (*circa* A.D. 250) is apparent only; see n. 329.

<sup>331</sup>I owe this important observation to E. Lohse. In passing we must deal with two objections to our conclusion. First: is it not implied by the repeated remark of the evangelists that the disciples did not understand the predictions of the passion that the conception of a suffering Messiah was completely unknown to them? Mark only adds the information about the failure of the disciples to understand to the second account of the prediction of the passion (9.32: οἱ δὲ ἤγνοον τὸ φῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο).

To sum up: (1) messianic interpretation of the Deutero-Isaianic servant in Palestinian Judaism was limited to Isa. 42.1 ff.,<sup>332</sup> 43.10;<sup>333</sup> 49.1 f., 6 f.,<sup>334</sup> and 52.13 ff.,<sup>335</sup> with this New Testament data agree.<sup>336</sup> (2) For Isa. 42.1 ff. and 52.13 ff. messianic interpretation is constant from pre-Christian times. Isa. 52.13 ff. is in this connexion regarded as a last judgement scene.<sup>337</sup> (3) As far as the messianic interpretation of the passages about suffering in Isa. 53.1–12 is concerned, this can again be traced back with great probability to pre-Christian times.<sup>338</sup> Here the suffering of the Messiah is thought of without exception up to the talmudic

αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι). Here it is a question of a more recent variant of the quite different remark of Peter (8.32, in connexion with the first prediction of the passion), the antiquity of which is assured by the sharpness of the rebuke of Jesus denouncing Peter as Satan. But the point is that the disciples' failure to understand is by no means, in Mark, related solely to the passion of Jesus, but runs like a motif through the whole of Mark's Gospel (4.13, 40 f.; 6.52; 7.18; 8.16–21; 9.32; 10.38); cf. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901, 93–114. In Mark 6.52 the disciples' lack of understanding occurs in a remark of the evangelist; 8.16–21 is, quite plainly, by its reference to the doublet of the feeding miracle, recognizable as a piece of literary composition. In Luke the motif is still more distinct (cf. 9.45 with Mark 9.32); he has added 18.34 without the Marcan parallel. Finally, the Gospel of John broadens the motif into a constant misunderstanding of the most far-reaching extent. Parallels in comparative religion make it probable that we have here an epiphany motif (J. Ebeling: 'Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten', *ZNW*, Beiheft 19, 1939, 167 f., 170). If that is correct then historical deductions are illegitimate. But even apart from that the misunderstanding would be intelligible (ἀγνοεῖν, Mark 9.32, can also mean 'fail to recognize'), for the passion and death of the Messiah completely contradicted popular expectations. Second: is it not implied in the offence which the Jews found in the preaching of the cross (I Cor. 1.23) that the conception of a suffering Messiah was alien to them? In fact the messianic interpretation of Isa. 53 must have been foreign to Hellenistic Judaism (cf. p. 53). So much more must the manner of the death of Jesus have been offensive and even for Palestinian Judaism this was the real scandal: death on the cross is accursed (Gal. 3.13; Justin, *Dial.*, 90).

<sup>332</sup>Cf. p. 53.

<sup>333</sup>Only in the *Targ.* ad loc. See p. 67 and n. 293.

<sup>334</sup>Cf. p. 59 and n. 305 and p. 57.

<sup>335</sup>Cf. pp. 57–76.

<sup>336</sup>Cf. p. 93. Only the messianic exegesis of Isa. 43.10 is not to be found in the N.T.

<sup>337</sup>Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism agree in relating Isa. 52.13 ff. to the last judgement (Wisd. 5.1 f.; Eth. En. 46.4 f.; 48.8; 55.4; 62.1–9; 63.1–11. J. Jeremias 'Das Lösegeld für Viele', *Judaica* 3, 1948, 263 f.).

<sup>338</sup>Outside LXX it is to be found in *Test. B.* (cf. p. 57), in the *Peshitta* (see p. 60), in Aquila (p. 62), in R. Jose (see p. 72) and R. Tryphon (see p. 73), in Theodotion (p. 64) and in other rabbinic texts (see p. 74) and traces of it probably in *Targ. Isa.* 53 (see p. 70). Against the idea that the messianic interpretation of Isa. 53 in Judaism belongs only to the second century A.D. Buber has recently expressed himself with decision (see Buber, 78, n. 6).

### *The Servant of God*

period as taking place before the final victorious establishment of his rule.<sup>339</sup> When the meaning of messianic suffering is considered, the answer is that the Messiah suffers vicariously to expiate the sins of Israel.<sup>340</sup>

<sup>339</sup>S.-B., II, 291.

<sup>340</sup>*Test.* B. 3.8, see p. 57; *Siphre Lev.*, see p. 72; *B. Sanh.* 98b, and *B. Sanh.* 98a, see p. 63 (cf. in addition S.-B., II, 286); *Ruth R.* 5 on 2.14, see n. 321; *Midr. Sam.* 19 § 1, see n. 322; *Pesiqt. R.* 31 (S.-B., II, 287); *Pesiqt. R.* 36 (S.-B., II, 288); *Midr. Konen* (S.-B., II, 290). Cf. S.-B., II, 291 f.—but note that only according to the *Peshitta* the Messiah suffers for the sins of many peoples (see Hegermann, 96 f. on Isa. 52.15).

## IV

## Παῖς Θεοῦ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The expression *παῖς* (of God)<sup>341</sup> occurs only rarely in the N.T. as in late Judaism (cf. p. 43): Matt. 12.18; Luke 1.54, 69; Acts 3.13, 26; 4.25, 27, 30. Of these eight texts one refers to Israel (Luke 1.54), two to David (Luke 1.69; Acts 4.25), the remaining five to Jesus.<sup>342</sup> The phrase in the Magnificat: ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ (Luke 1.54) is a reference to Isa. 41.8 f.: σὺ δέ, Ἰσραὴλ, παῖς μου Ἰακώβ, δὲ ἐξελεξάμην, σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, δὲ ἡγάπησα, οὐ ἀντελαβόμην. The collective use of the expression corresponds to what we find in the O.T. (cf. n. 175) and in late Judaism (cf. nn. 177, 213). As in *Ps. Sol.* 12.6 the pious nucleus of Israel is thought of. The liturgical style, too, is also common to Luke 1.54 and *Ps. Sol.* 12.6; 17.21. The description of David as servant of God likewise has associations with late Judaism. As there (see n. 184) so too in primitive Christianity we find the use of it occurring exclusively in prayers: in the Benedictus, Luke 1.69: ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ; in the prayer of the primitive community after the release of the apostles, Acts 4.25: ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπών;<sup>343</sup> and in the eucharistic prayer accompanying the chalice, *Did.* 9.2: εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου 'of whom David thy servant speaks' (i.e., in *Ps. 80.8 ff.*).<sup>344</sup> 'David

<sup>341</sup>Throughout the N.T. with the possessive pronoun: ὁ παῖς μου (Matt. 12.18), σου (Acts 4.25, 27, 30), αὐτοῦ (Luke 1.54, 69; Acts 3.13, 26), i.e., of God.

<sup>342</sup>Christians on the other hand are called δοῦλοι Θεοῦ, never παῖδες Θεοῦ.

<sup>343</sup>The text is overcharged. Presumably the two words πνεύματος ἀγίου are quite an old gloss.

<sup>344</sup>R. Eisler has demonstrated convincingly, 'Das Letzte Abendmahl', *ZNW*, 25, 1926, 6 f., that this is the meaning of the apparently puzzling expression ἡ ἀγία ἔμπελος Δαυὶδ.

'thy servant' is therefore a liturgical formula of late Judaism which primitive Christianity took over.

It is likewise a question of O.T. and late Jewish usage when in I. *Cl.* 39.4 (= Job 4.18) the angels, in II Esd. (IV Ezra) 1.32; 2.1 (second century A.D.) the prophets and in 2.18 Isaiah and Jeremiah are called the servants of God (cf. n. 174 [angels] and n. 167 [prophets]).

### 1 Παῖς Θεοῦ AS A TITLE OF JESUS

(i) *The origin of the title.* In the N.T. Jesus receives the title παῖς Θεοῦ strikingly seldom, viz. only in one quotation in Matt. (12.18 = Isa. 42.1), and in four places in Acts (3.13, 26; 4.27, 30). In all five instances we have to do with an ancient tradition.

For Matt. 12.18 this is clear from the mixed character of the quotation. Behind Matt. 12.18–20 (=Isa. 42.1–3) there lies the Heb. text,<sup>345</sup> but in the last verse of the quotation (Matt. 12.21 = Isa. 42.4d) suddenly we find that the LXX is cited.<sup>346</sup> Thus two hands are visible,<sup>347</sup> which allows us to infer a previous history of the text. That the first hand uses the Heb. text points back to the area of semitic linguistic usage. As regards the four places in the Acts, an ancient date is suggested by the fact that the occurrence of παῖς Θεοῦ is confined to Acts 3, 4, i.e., to a Palestinian stratum of tradition which in other respects, too, is marked by its ancient character.<sup>348</sup>

But it may be presumed that the description of Jesus as παῖς Θεοῦ lies behind yet other N.T. passages. We must note here chiefly the voice of the baptism (Mark 1.11 par.) and the voice at the transfiguration (Mark 9.7 par.).

<sup>345</sup>The wording of the text in Matthew deviates much from the LXX, whose collective interpretation of παῖς in Isa. 42.1 (see p. 52) would not have made possible the application of the passage to Jesus. (Against the hypothesis of Kahle, op. cit. in n. 257, 167, that Matthew used an older lost Greek translation of Isa., cf. P. Katz 'Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta', TZ, 5, 1949, 18).

<sup>346</sup>LXX has for ἴηρίνη (Isa. 42.4) ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ which must be a scribal error for ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ (Ziegler, 'Isaias', ad loc.). In Matt. τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, the scribal error of LXX recurs.

<sup>347</sup>Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus*, 1929, 402. Matthew himself seems to be quoting from LXX.

<sup>348</sup>Gewiess, 39; W. Grundmann, 'Das Problem des hellenistischen Christentums innerhalb der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde', ZNW, 38, 1939, 53; see especially Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht*, 143.

*The Servant of God in the New Testament*

The comparison of:

Mark 1.11 = Luke 3.22 <sup>349</sup>	with	Isa 42.1 (as quoted in Matt. 12.18)
par. Matt. 3.17		
σὺ εἶ (οὗτός ἐστιν Matt.) ὁνίός μου		ἰδού ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἤρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός,
ἐν σοι (ῷ Matt.) εὐδόκησα		ὅν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου.
(cf. Mark 1.10 par.: τὸ πνεῦμα		Θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν
. . . καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν		

has long since suggested the question whether the *υἱός μου* of the voice at the baptism and the transfiguration does not go back to *παῖς μου* (so LXX Isa. 42.1). In that case Mark 1.11 par. and 9.7 par. would not be a combined quotation from Ps. 2.7 and Isa. 42.1, but originally only Isa. 42.1 (Heb. text) would have been quoted and the ambiguous *παῖς μου* (1: my servant; 2: my child) would before Mark have been clarified to *υἱός μου* on Hellenistic territory where the description of Jesus as *παῖς μου* was early avoided.<sup>350</sup>

The hypothesis that the voice at the baptism was originally purely an echo of Isa. 42.1 is supported by several considerations. First, the heavenly voice, Mark 1.11, is obviously meant to explain the impartation of the Spirit (Mark 1.10) as a fulfilment of scripture.<sup>351</sup> As so often in O.T. quotations, e.g., in rabbinic literature, the continuation of the passage (Isa. 42.1 in Matt. 12.18c) is implied but not actually quoted: Θήσω<sup>352</sup> τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν. Thus the heavenly voice affirms that the promise given in Isa. 42.1 about the gift of the Spirit has just been fulfilled. Second, when the text of the divine declaration at the baptism and the transfiguration wavers between *ἀγαπητός*

<sup>349</sup>The Western reading of Luke 3.22: *ὑἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἔγώ σὴμερον γεγέννηκά σε* (=LXX Ps. 2.7) is nothing except one of those assimilations of N.T. quotations to the O.T. original (in this case supposed) which the Western text has undertaken in numerous instances and which are highly characteristic of it, e.g., Mark 15.34 par. Matt. 27.46, where the Western text has replaced the Aramaic quotation of Ps. 22 by the Heb. text.

<sup>350</sup>Dalman, *WJ*, 277; cf. Bousset, 57 n. 2; Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht*, 9: cf. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, 16–18. A similar process occurs with regard to the text of John 1.34 where the original *ὁ ἐκλεκτός* becomes *ὁ υἱός* (see n. 261); here again it is a question of Isa. 42.1.

<sup>351</sup>Dalman, *WJ*, 277.

<sup>352</sup>The perfect of the Heb. text is translated as future in Matt. 12.18.

(Mark 1.11 par.; 9.7 par. Matt. 17.5 and Luke 9.35 v.l., II Peter 1.17) and ἐκλελεγμένος (Luke 9.35), we presumably have variations in the translation of Isa. 42.1, which is sometimes rendered by ἐκλεκτός (LXX, Σ and Θ), and sometimes by ἀγαπητός (Matt. 12.18). Third, in John 1.34 the heavenly voice at the baptism,<sup>353</sup> according to the supposed oldest text (see n. 261), is given in the words: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλεκτός τοῦ θεοῦ. But ‘the chosen of God’ is a messianic designation coming from Isa. 42.1 (cf. pp. 58 ff.). John 1.34 shows very plainly that the baptismal declaration originally must have been a consistent quotation from Isa. 42.1. If that is correct then it would be confirmed (cf. p. 80) that the designation of Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ belongs to a very old (pre-Markan) layer of the tradition.<sup>354</sup>

Further indirect evidence of the παῖς θεοῦ prediction and its great antiquity is possibly furnished by the Johannine literature.

First, we have John 1.29, 36: ἵδε ὁ ἄμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (+v. 29: ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ χόσμου). It has already been shown (*TWNT*, I, 342 f., 185.19 ff.) that the expression ὁ ἄμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ conceals both a factual and a linguistic difficulty. (1) The description of the Saviour as a lamb is unknown to late Judaism. (2) The expression is an unparalleled genitive combination. Both difficulties are solved if we refer to the Aramaic where נְאַלְפָן means (a) the lamb, (b) the boy, the servant.<sup>355</sup> Probably behind the phrase ὁ ἄμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ lies an Aramaic נְאַלְפָן עֲבָד יְהוָה in the sense of ‘servant of God’ (cf. n. 164, 176);<sup>356</sup> this

<sup>353</sup>Cullmann, *Baptism*, 16 ff., also *Early Christian Worship*, 64 f.

<sup>354</sup>The consequences which result from this are extraordinarily far-reaching. It means not merely that the voice at baptism has nothing to do with kingly enthronement, adoption, etc., but that there arises above all the question whether the παῖς θεοῦ prediction does not play an essential part in the emergence of the messianic title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ which was unknown to late Judaism.

<sup>355</sup>Examples of נְאַלְפָן = ‘servant’ in the west Aramaic dialects (Palestinian *Midrash* and *Talmud*, the *Targums*, and Christian Palestinian dialect) may be found in J. Jeremias, «'Αμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ», 116 f.

<sup>356</sup>C. J. Ball, ‘Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?’, *ET*, 21, 1909/10, 92f.; C. F. Burney, 107 f.; Lohmeyer, *Apokalypse* (HNT), 1951, 52; J. Jeremias, «'Αμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ», 115–23; Zolli, 228–33; W. F. Howard, *Christianity According to St. John*, 1943, 100 f.; G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, 1947, 91 n. 4; Cullmann, *Baptism*, 21 n. 1; ‘Gesù’, 55; *Early Christian Worship*, 65 f. In regard to the opinion expressed by C. H. Dodd (in his discussion of the *TWNT* article «ἄμνος») in *JTS*, 34, 1933, 285, that

supposition is also supported by the reference of John 1. 29b δὲ αἱρῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου to the ‘ebed’ phrase Isa. 53.12 **וְהִוא חֶטָּא רַبִּים נְשָׁא** (cf. TWNT, I, 185, 25 ff.). Also the description of Jesus in Rev. (28 times)<sup>357</sup> as ἀρνίον must on account of the lack of an analogy in late Judaism, go back to the same ambiguous **אֵילָן**.<sup>358</sup> If this hypothesis is correct, then the predication παῖς θεοῦ of Jesus must spring from the Aramaic-speaking primitive church.

A surprising confirmation of the great antiquity of the predication is furnished, finally, by its history in the ancient church.<sup>359</sup> Apart from three quotations<sup>360</sup> and from Acts, the description of Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ in gentile Christian literature is met with up to 160 only at eleven places and only in three writings.

It is found in the *Didache* in the old prayers of the agape<sup>361</sup> (celebrated before the eucharist) to be said before and after the meal (9.2, 3; 10.2, 3) and in the prayer for unction (10.7 Copt.);<sup>362</sup> in all five places we have the stereotyped formula: διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου;<sup>363</sup> also in the great Roman church prayer I Cl. 59, 2–4,<sup>364</sup> in Polycarp’s prayer<sup>365</sup> joined to the eucharistic

Targ. Isa. renders **וְהִיא בְּבָד** by **עֲבָדָה** (not by **אֵילָן**), we must recall what was said on pp. 51 f.: from about A.D. 100, Greek-speaking Judaism brusquely changes from παῖς θεοῦ to δοῦλος θεοῦ; we may assume that Aramaic-speaking Judaism made a similar change from **תָּלִיא** to **עֲבָדָה**. In addition, it is to be noted that the primitive church demonstrably spoke of Jesus as παῖς (= \***אֵילָן**) (Acts 3.13, 26; 4.27, 30) in express distinction from the N.T. messengers of God who are called δοῦλοι (= \***אָנָּשִׁים עֲבָדָה**) θεοῦ.

<sup>357</sup> Probably (owing to the lacking τοῦ θεοῦ) circuitously through ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (a point made by Kuhn).

<sup>358</sup> TWNT, I, 343, 15–19; Lohmeyer, *Apokalypse*, 52.

<sup>359</sup> By the brilliant investigation of A. v. Harnack, ‘Die Bezeichnung Jesu als ‘Knecht Gottes’ und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche’ this has been illuminated in exemplary fashion.

<sup>360</sup> Matt. 12.18; further Barn. where παῖς κυρίου (6.1) and in particular παῖς μου (9.2) are inserted in O.T. quotations.

<sup>361</sup> Cf. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 84 f.

<sup>362</sup> Ed. C. Schmidt, ‘Das koptische Didache-Fragment des British Museum’, ZNW, 24, 1925, 85, cf. 94.

<sup>363</sup> Did. 10.3: read ‘Ιησοῦ’ with the Coptic translation.

<sup>364</sup> I Cl. 59.2: διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδός αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 59.3: διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδός σου; 59.4: σὺ εἰ δὲ θεός μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός δὲ παῖς σου.

<sup>365</sup> See v. Harnack, 221, cf. Bousset, 56.

prayer of Smyrna, *Mart. Pol.* 14.1–3<sup>366</sup> and in the concluding doxology of the *Mart. Pol.* 20.2.<sup>367</sup> Thus in all eleven places we have to do with prayers and (with the exception of the doxo-logical formulae I Cl. 59.4, see n. 364; *Mart. Pol.* 14.1, see n. 366) always with the liturgical formula: διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.

This plain prayer formula is very old.<sup>368</sup> So much is already clear from the absence of Χριστός in the oldest examples of the formula (Acts 4.30; *Did.* 9.2, 3; 10.2, 3, 7)<sup>369</sup> but especially from the observation that in διὰ Δαυΐδ τοῦ παιδός σου (Acts 4.25) it has an old Palestinian<sup>370</sup> parallel. Further, of the four examples in Acts, two stand in a prayer (4.27, 30), and one of these likewise offers the formula διὰ . . . τοῦ . . . παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ (4.30). Surveying the examples of the description of Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ we may conclude (1) that the title παῖς θεοῦ was at no time on gentile Christian territory an accepted designation of the Messiah (it is not found in Paul); the titles κύριος, Χριστός, υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ were there preferred. (2) In the gentile churches the title lived on rather as a liturgical formula which became fixed at an early date and which was anchored in the eucharistic prayer, in the doxology and in the confession.<sup>371</sup>

Later times confirm these views.<sup>372</sup> παῖς θεοῦ remains infrequent. The title persists in prayers and doxologies, otherwise almost solely in solemn sacral speech. It does not influence the phraseology of dogmatics but remains confined to liturgy and exalted speech. From the fifth century παῖς disappears altogether as a description of Christ.<sup>373</sup>

If our examination so far has, step by step, pointed to the ancient

<sup>366</sup> *Mart. Pol.* 14.1: δ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατήρ, δι' οὗ . . . 14.3: διὰ . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός.

<sup>367</sup> 20.2: διὰ τοῦ παιδός αὐτοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>368</sup> v. Harnack, 235, n. 3 considers the question whether the frequent Pauline formula διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is an imitation of διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.

<sup>369</sup> v. Harnack, 219 f.

<sup>370</sup> Cf. II Sam. 3.18: יְהוָה עֶבֶד פִּילַד =LXX: ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ δούλου μου Δαυΐδ; I Mac. 4.30: ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ δούλου σου Δαυΐδ (with διὰ cum acc. Isa. 37.35: διὰ Δαυΐδ τὸν παῖδά μου; with δοῦλος: III Bas. 11.13, 32, 34; IV Bas. 8.19; 19.34; 20.6; with ἔνεκεν: ψ 131.10).

<sup>371</sup> I Cl. 59.4: σὺ εἶ δ θεὸς μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δ παῖς σου is a formula of confession.

<sup>372</sup> Collection of material in v. Harnack, 224–33.

<sup>373</sup> v. Harnack, 236–8.

date of the title and its origin in Palestine, the information given by Epiphanius that the Ebionites ἔνα θεὸν καταγγέλλουσι καὶ τὸν τούτου παῖδα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν<sup>374</sup> gains in significance. Above all, the disappearance in Palestinian Judaism of ‘God’s servant’ as a description of the Messiah (cf. p. 85) is indirect evidence of the fact that the description of Jesus as servant of God was alive in Palestinian Christianity. Thus we must seek the home and origin of the title<sup>375</sup> in the first Palestinian community. From the first it was offensive to the gentile church on account of its lowliness.

(ii) *The meaning of the predication.* The fact that as a description of Jesus παῖς θεοῦ means originally ‘servant of God’ (not ‘child of God’), is implied by the striking reserve shown by the gentile church towards this predication—a reserve which can only be due to the offence caused by its lowly character. But it is also implied by the application of the title in neighbouring passages to David and Jesus in Acts (David: 4.25; Jesus: 4.27, 30) and in the *Didache* (David: 9.2; Jesus: 9.2, 3): for it is certain that David is here called servant of God.<sup>376</sup> The only question is whether we have here merely a title of honour for the application of which to eminent men of God there is evidence (cf. p. 48) in late Judaism<sup>377</sup> (of course only in isolated cases)—e.g., David: Luke, 1.69; Acts 4.25; *Did.* 9.2—or whether there is a special reminiscence of the servant texts of Deut. Isa.<sup>378</sup>

We must not make the alternative too sharp since in both cases the title is one of honour; we might also possibly have to reckon with a transition from the general to the special use. The possibility that it is an instance of the general title seems to find support in the juxtaposition of παῖς θεοῦ Δαυὶδ and παῖς θεοῦ Ἰησοῦς (cf. l. 18 above), which Acts seems to find inadequate.<sup>379</sup> Nevertheless, it will be well to be on one’s guard against the idea that ‘his (thy holy) servant (Jesus)’, Acts 3.13, 26; 4.27, 30,

<sup>374</sup>Epiph. *Haer.* 29.7.3. Cf. Bousset 56 f., especially cf. 56, n. 2.

<sup>375</sup>Rightly observed by Bousset, 57. See further, pp. 94 f. below.

<sup>376</sup>παῖς θεοῦ in the meaning ‘child of God’ is besides extraordinarily infrequent in Hellenistic Judaism (cf. p. 43).

<sup>377</sup>Thus especially Cadbury.

<sup>378</sup>This is the predominant view represented above all by v. Harnack.

<sup>379</sup>The fact that only in Acts 4.27, 30 (not 3.13, 26) is the adjective ἄγιος found in connexion with Jesus (δὲ ἄγιος παῖς σου Ἰησοῦς) could be caused by the intention to make a difference between the παῖς Jesus and the παῖς David (4.25).

is merely a name of honour applied to Jesus as to other men of God; for the primitive church from the very first regarded Jesus as the Messiah. Παῖς θεοῦ, however, in the O.T. and in late Judaism, was at no time a title of the Messiah (cf. p. 50) but occurs without exception as a messianic designation only in the form 'my servant' of divine discourse; whereas in Acts, as the possessive pronouns show ('his'—Acts 3.13, 36; 'thy' servant—4.27, 30), servant of God is a title of Jesus. Thus παῖς θεοῦ as a messianic title cannot have been transferred to Jesus. In that case so much the more important are the associations of the designation of Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ with Deut. Isa., to be found not merely in the form of quotation (Matt. 12.18; see further p. 81 on Mark 1.11 par.; 9.7 par.), but also of reference (Acts 3.13 cf. 14<sup>380</sup>; see p. 82 on John 1.29 and p. 97 on Phil. 2.6–11).

Thus it must on balance appear probable that the predication of Jesus as the servant of God is meant from the start to characterize him as the servant of the Lord prophesied in Isa. 42 and 53.<sup>381</sup> At the very least the transition from the general use of the title as a mark of honour to the special connexion with Deut. Isa. must have taken place very early.

(iii) *The semantic change from 'servant of God' to 'child of God'.* In the gentile churches παῖς θεοῦ as a description of Jesus had acquired at latest by the second century the meaning 'child of God'.

This change of meaning is certainly present in *Mart. Pol.* 14. 1: κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατήρ (as the combination παῖς/πατήρ shows) and 20.2: διὰ τοῦ παιδός αὐτοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

<sup>380</sup> It should be noticed that the very first of the four passages in Acts (3.13, 26; 4.27, 30) plainly alludes to Deut. Isa. Acts 3.13: ὁ θεὸς . . . ἐδόξασεν τὸν παιδία αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (cf. Isa. 52.13: ὁ παῖς μου . . . δοξασθήσεται), διν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε (cf. Isa. 53.6: παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν) καὶ ἡρνήσασθε (cf. Isa. 53.2 *Peshitta*; Eth. En. 48.10); 3.14: τὸν ἄγιον καὶ δίκαιον (cf. Isa. 53.11: δίκαιον, cf. p. 59) ἡρνήσασθε; 3.18: (God) προκατήγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ. The reference of Acts 3.13 to Isa. 52.13 also appears in the fact that Acts 3.13 is the only text in the Synoptics and Acts in which δοξάζειν has the meaning 'transfigure'.

<sup>381</sup> Cf. v. Harnack, 213; cf. Torrey, 32 f.; also M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*<sup>2</sup>, 1933, 16; Euler, 45; Wolff, 86 f.; Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht*, 22 f.

## The Servant of God in the New Testament

(as the association with μονογενής shows).<sup>382</sup> It is probable<sup>383</sup> that the understanding of παῖς θεοῦ as 'child of God' is already present in I Cl. 59.2 f. where Jesus Christ is called ὁ ἡγαπημένος παῖς. Also the formula σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ παῖς σου (59.4) points to the sense 'child of God'.<sup>384</sup> It is certain that the semantic change from servant to child of God was a gradual one<sup>385</sup> and that it did not take place<sup>386</sup> everywhere at the same time. The meaning 'servant of God', as the *Didache* shows (cf. p. 85), persisted most obstinately in liturgical formulae.

How obvious for Hellenistic feeling the understanding of παῖς θεοῦ as 'child of God' must have been is clear from contemporary literature; for Hellenistic Judaism cf. pp. 44, 51, for Hellenistic paganism cf. *Corp. Herm.* XIII, 2<sup>387</sup>: ὁ γεννώμενος θεοῦ θεὸς παῖς. XIII, 4: the new birth effects ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς, ἀνθρωπος εἰς. XIII, 14: θεὸς πέφυκας καὶ τοῦ ἐνδος παῖς. In addition the word παῖς had something archaic and distinguished about it,<sup>388</sup> so that, for example, the emperor's son could be described as Καίσαρος παῖς.<sup>389</sup> At the same time it must not be forgotten that in παῖς the more lowly associations are always present as well; for this reason παῖς θεοῦ, in spite of the semantic change from 'servant' to 'son of God' was unable to take root in the area of gentile Christianity (cf. p. 84).

<sup>382</sup>Cf. the ecstatic exclamation of the prophets mentioned by Celsus: ἔγώ ὁ θεός εἰμι ἢ θεοῦ παῖς ἢ πνεῦμα (Orig. *Cels.* 7.9).

<sup>383</sup>Dalman, *WJ*, 278: 'unmistakable'.

<sup>384</sup>We are taken back to a still earlier period if the supposition is correct that a παῖς μου lay behind the υἱός μου of the story of the baptism and transfiguration (cf. pp. 80 f.), and that the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ grew out of ὁ παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ (see n. 354).

<sup>385</sup>The old Latin Codices of Acts 3.13, 26 and 4.27, 30 give us a glimpse into the process: in all four texts an original *puer* is gradually supplanted by *filius* (v. Harnack, 218). In this matter the *Codices* are to some extent fluctuating: the *Vulgata* still has *filius* in Acts 3.13, 26; 4.30, but *puer* in 4.27 (under the influence of 4.25). The repugnance to *puer* is, in the western church, 'almost as old as the translation itself' (v. Harnack, 218), already the Bible text of Tertullian read, 4.27, *filius* (*Tertullian Bapt.*, 7; *adversus Præter.*, 28). Quite similar is the fluctuation of the Christian translator of II. Esd. (IV Ezra) in the rendering of the messianic title παῖς μου (see n. 196).

<sup>386</sup>The Syr. has ⲥ⠁ in all four places: Acts 3.13, 26; 4.27, 30.

<sup>387</sup>*Corp. Herm.*, ed. A. D. Nock-A. J. Festugière, I, II = *Collection des Universités de France* (1945).

<sup>388</sup>v. Harnack, 225; on p. 237 he compares the German word 'Weib'.

<sup>389</sup>Justin, *Epit.* 2.16; cf. Melito in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* IV 26.7; Athenag. *Suppl.* 37.1.

2. CHRISTOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH  
SERVANT OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It became clear on investigating *παῖς θεοῦ* in late Judaism (pp. 43 ff.) that mere linguistic inquiry, however indispensable as a basis, did not lead us to the heart of the problem of the servant of God. In order to grapple with this the question of the interpretation of Deut. Isa. servant passages in late Judaism had to be approached. Exactly the same applies to the N.T. We broach the decisive question only when we ask: (a) where in the N.T. do we find christological interpretations of the servant passages of Deut. Isa.? (b) What is their historical setting in the life of the early church?

(i) *The evidence.* There are strikingly few N.T. passages where in specific quotation a word relating to the servant of Deut. Isa. is applied to Jesus: Matt. 8.17 (Isa. 53.4); 12.18–21 (Isa. 42.1–4); Luke 22.37 (Isa. 53.12); John 12.38 (Isa. 53.1); Acts 8.32 f. (Isa. 53.7 f.);<sup>390</sup> Rom. 15.21 (Isa. 52.15).<sup>391</sup> But the limitation to express quotations would give a false picture, and in our problem especially would involve a serious error of method such as has not always been avoided.<sup>392</sup> If we add to the quotations direct or indirect allusions then we have the following picture of the N.T. evidence of the christological interpretations of the Deut. Isa. servant:

(a) Pre-Pauline stock of tradition and formulae. Here must first be mentioned the primitive *kerygma* of I Cor. 15.3–5 which is based on a semitic original,<sup>393</sup> and of which the κατὰ τὰς γραφάς of v. 3, because of the ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, must be an allusion to Isa. 53.<sup>394</sup> Further, to this pre-Pauline stock of

<sup>390</sup>In Acts 13.47: τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς (= Isa. 49.6, LXX) it cannot safely be said whether the twofold σε is related to Jesus or to the apostles. But the introduction (οὗτως γάρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν δὲ κύριος) and the comparison with Acts 26.18 says more for the second possibility.

<sup>391</sup>The christological feature lies in περὶ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>392</sup>Rightly emphasized by Wolff, 69, 79, 85, 102, 106, etc. Also the usual limitation to Isa. 53, and omission of the other servant passages of Deut. Isa., prejudices the picture.

<sup>393</sup>To the examples given in Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 129 ff. should be added the *parallelismus membrorum* between the first and third διτι phrases, both of which end with κατὰ τὰς γραφάς; a shorter διτι phrase (second and fourth διτι phrases) is co-ordinated.

<sup>394</sup>Most recently cf. Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht*, 39; Cullmann, 'Gesù', 57 f.

tradition belong the liturgically formulated<sup>395</sup> eucharistic words of I Cor. 11.23–25,<sup>396</sup> the christological formula of Rom. 4.25<sup>397</sup> built up in synthetic *parallelismus membrorum*, the confessional formula of Rom. 8.34 (cf. p. 95), the Christ hymn in Phil. 2.6–11,<sup>398</sup> the word about ransom in I Tim. 2.6 (see n. 401), and the ancient ὑπέρ formula, very frequent in Paul, with its variants (see n. 435), which in Rom. 8.32 (ὑπέρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν) is connected with an expression from Isa. 53.6 LXX (παρέδωκεν αὐτόν).<sup>399</sup> This means that all Pauline allusions to the ‘ebed-Yahweh texts of Deut. Isa. apart from Rom. 15.21 (see p. 93), make use of an ancient stock of tradition.

(b) Pre-synoptic stock of tradition and formulae. In the synoptics, too, most of the allusions to the ‘ebed-Yahweh texts of Deut. Isa. can be shown to be based on ancient tradition. This is the case for the ancient eucharistic formulae (Mark 14.24 par.)<sup>400</sup> and the λύτρον saying (Mark 10.45 par. Matt. 20.28)<sup>401</sup> with certainty on account of the linguistic characteristics; for

<sup>395</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 128 ff.

<sup>396</sup> For the allusion to Isa. 53 see n. 438 (παρεδίδοτο) and p. 95 below (a ὑπέρ formula).

<sup>397</sup> παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν Rom. 4.25 is a free quotation from διὰ τὰς δικαιόσιας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη Isa. 53.12, LXX (cf. διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν 53.5, LXX); the fact of a free quotation is confirmed by διὰ with the accusative instead of Paul’s usual ὑπέρ (cf. n. 435), and by the absolute use of the passive παραδίδονται, cf. n. 438. For the pre-Pauline character of the formula cf. H. Leitzmann *An die Römer*<sup>4</sup>, 1933, ad loc.; Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, 1955, 132, 136; Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 31.

<sup>398</sup> For the allusion to Isa. 53 see p. 97 below. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, has demonstrated the pre-Pauline character of Phil. 2.6 ff. It is confirmed by the observation that the Heb. text of Isa. 53 is used.

<sup>399</sup> Also Rom. 3.25 should belong here: Ἰλαστήριον (atoning sacrifice, analogous to σωτήριον, χαριστήριον, καθάρισιον scil. θῦμα) might be a rendering of בְּלֵן (Isa. 53.10); for the pre-Pauline age of the passage cf. διὰ and acc. (n. 435), which is unusual in Paul, and Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 31, 46. If Rom. 5.19b (διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς δίκαιου κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί) is a reference to Isa. 53.11 . . . קִידָּשׁ (יְהִי רָצֶן) (thus S. Mowinckel, ‘Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet’, ZNW, 32, 1933, 121, n. 82 and Cullmann, ‘Gesù’, 58), then the traditional character of this allusion too would result from the use of the Hebrew text. Paul himself uses the LXX.

<sup>400</sup> Allusion to Isa. 53: Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 147 ff., cf. 123–5. For Palestinian character of the language: ibid. 118–26. Independence of LXX: ὑπέρ is missing in LXX Isa. 53, see n. 434.

<sup>401</sup> Allusions to Isa. 53.10–12 (moreover to Heb. text): recent works: Jeremias, ‘Lösegeld’, 262–4; also *Eucharistic Words*, 125; for Palestinian character of the language, cf. Jeremias ‘Lösegeld’, 260–2, also *Eucharistic Words*, 123–5.

the voice at the baptism (Mark 1.11 par. = Isa. 42.1) on account of its independence of LXX;<sup>402</sup> for Luke 2.32 on account of the whole stylistic and linguistic character of the hymn (2.29–32);<sup>403</sup> for Matt. 12.18–21 (=Isa. 42.1–4) on account of the mixed character of the text (cf. p. 80); for Luke 22.37 (=Isa. 53.12)<sup>404</sup> and for Matt. 8.17 (=Isa. 53.4 Heb. text) on account of the connexion with the Heb. text (cf. n. 347). That the numerous general references to scripture which are met with in all three synoptics in connexion with Jesus' words about his passion<sup>405</sup> are also—probably even primarily—allusions to Isa. 53, is shown by the ancient character<sup>406</sup> of Mark 9.12 (ἐξουδενηθῆ cf. ἐξουδενωμένος Isa. 53.3 'Α, Σ, Θ = יְהִי), also by the frequent παραδιδόναι formula (see n. 437) and Luke 22.37;<sup>407</sup> it is clear from I Cor. 15.3 that the greater part of these scriptural allusions is pre-synoptic (cf. p. 88). Quite astonishing is the almost complete disappearance of the LXX in the synoptic texts: while many of them reveal the influence of the Heb. text,<sup>408</sup> that of the LXX is only visible in the *addendum* Matt. 12.21 (cf. p. 80), Luke 22.37, and perhaps in the passive use of παραδίδονται.<sup>409</sup> The result is similar to that in regard to Paul: almost

<sup>402</sup>Cf. furthermore what was said on pp. 82 f. above about the great age of Mark 1.11 par. and 9.7 par.

<sup>403</sup>The expression in Luke 2.32: φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνῶν is a reminiscence of a servant text which is literally the same in Isa. 42.6 and 49.6 (**אֹתֶר גָּזִים** לִילִ); but the juxtaposition of heathen and Israel (Luke 2.32 a b) shows that Isa. 49.6 is the closer.

<sup>404</sup>Luke 22.37: καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη cf. Isa. 53.12: καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη (i.e., with article and ἐν).

<sup>405</sup>Mark 8.31 par. (δεῖ); 9.12 par.; 14.21 par. (γέγραπται); 14.49 par. (ἴνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ); Luke 18.31 (τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν), cf. Mark 10.32 par. (μέλλειν, so also Matt. 17.12, 22; Luke 9.44); peculiar to Matt., 26.54 (πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ . . . δεῖ); peculiar to Luke, 13.33; 17.25; 24.7, 25–27, 44–46 (δεῖ); 9.31 (ἥμελλεν πληροῦν); 22.22 (κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον); 24.32 (διήνοιγεν . . . τὰς γραφάς); 24.44 (δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα); 46 (γέγραπται).

<sup>406</sup>Cf. Otto, 197–9; Michaelis, 8 f. The antiquity of this is clear from the indefinite character of the announcement of the passion and from the observation that the four-part statement in Mark 8.31 is obviously a more recent expansion of the two-part statement of 9.12.

<sup>407</sup>Cf. also Luke 18.31: τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

<sup>408</sup>Mark 1.11 par. (cf. 9.7 par.); 9.12; 10.45; 14.24; Matt. 8.17; 12. 18–20; Luke 22.37.

<sup>409</sup>Cf. Isa. 53.12 LXX. Yet the LXX influence is not certain here because this passive is also found in *Targ.* Isa. 53.5: **אָמַת סְרֵךְ**.

all allusions to the Deut. Isa. 'ebed-Yahweh texts to be found in the first three gospels come from an ancient stock of tradition and formulae.

(c) Stock of tradition and formulae in Acts. In Acts we find 8.32 f. a citation from Isa. 53.7 f. LXX in application to Jesus; it occurs in the fragment of tradition dealing with Philip, 8.5-40,<sup>410</sup> the antiquity of which is especially evident from the way baptism is performed in 8.12 ff., 36, 38 f.<sup>411</sup> Also the description of Jesus as παῖς,<sup>412</sup> the occurrence of which is limited to Acts 3 and 4, belongs to a very ancient stratum of the tradition. Further, Jesus is called ὁ δίκαιος three times in Acts (3.14; 7.52; 22.14). Since in all three passages there is an article but no noun, we are here faced by a title, most probably the messianic title 'the righteous one' known from the *Eth. En.* (cf. p. 59), and alluding in the latter to Isa. 53.11. A comparison of Acts 22.13 f. with 9.17 (ὁ δίκαιος/ὁ κύριος) shows that ὁ δίκαιος is the older title of dignity.<sup>413</sup> Finally, in the discourses of Acts the scriptural allusions in passages about the suffering and death of Jesus are so stereotyped<sup>414</sup> that we must see in them an integral part of the primitive *kerygma*.<sup>415</sup>

(d) Ancient formulae in I Peter. In I Peter 2.21-25 are to be found a whole series of free quotations from Isa. 53 LXX (v. 22: Isa. 53.9; v. 24a: Isa. 53.12, cf. 4.11; v. 24b: Isa. 53.5; v. 25: Isa. 53.6), which were used in part as formulae (cf. p. 96); further, in I Peter 3.18 περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν is probably an allusion to Isa. 53.10; δίκαιος to 53.11. Both in I Peter 2.21-25 and in 3.18 the old ὑπέρ formula is met with (2.21; 3.18; cf. p. 95). Both passages use traditional liturgical material, the first a hymn to

<sup>410</sup> Joachim Jeremias, 'Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte', *ZNW*, 36, 1937, 215 f.

<sup>411</sup> 8.12 ff.: baptism without reception of the Spirit; 36, 38 f.: baptism without catechumenate.

<sup>412</sup> For the reference of Acts 3.13 f. to Isa. 53 see n. 380.

<sup>413</sup> Jackson-Lake concludes (*Beginnings of Christianity*, I, 4, 1933) from the comparison of Acts 9.17 with 22.14 that ὁ δίκαιος = נָבִי־תְּשׁׁוּבָה was perhaps 'the oldest title given to Jesus'.

<sup>414</sup> 2.23 (τῇ ὥρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Isa. 53.10); 3.18, cf. 7.52 (προκαταγγέλλειν); 13.27; 26.22 f. (οἱ προφῆται); 3.18, cf. 10.43 (plerophorically πάντες οἱ προφῆται); 4.28 (προορίζειν); 13.29 (πάντα τὰ . . . γεγραμμένα); 17.2 (γραφαῖς) 3, (ἐδει).

<sup>415</sup> Dibelius (op. cit., see n. 381), 15.

Christ, the second christological formulae.<sup>416</sup> In I Peter 1.11 we find again the general scriptural allusions in connexion with the passion of Christ, familiar to us already from the primitive *kerygma* (cf. p. 88), the synoptics (cf. p. 90) and Acts (cf. p. 91).

(e) Ancient formulae in the Johannine writings. Here again allusions to the 'ēbed of Deut. Isa. belong without exception to an old stratum of tradition. We first refer to what has already been discussed: on John 1.29 (ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἄμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου) and 1.36 see p. 82; on 1.34 (ὁ ἐκλεκτός) see p. 82; on 3.14; 12.34 (δεῖ) <sup>417</sup> see n. 405. On I John 2.1, 29; 3.7 (δίκαιος) see above; on 2.2; 4.10 (ἱλασμός) see n. 431; on 3.5 (τὰς ἄμαρτίας αἴρειν) see p. 96; on 3.5 (ἄμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν) see p. 96; on ἀρνίον in Rev. see p. 83.<sup>418</sup> Further the expression τιθέναι τὴν ψυχήν (John 10.11, 15, 17, 18) is to be mentioned; it is reminiscent of Isa. 53.10 (Heb.), 53.12 (Aram.) and as the comparison with Mark 10.45 par. (διδόναι τὴν ψυχήν) and the ὑπέρ formula (p. 95) show, it is traditional.<sup>419</sup> John 16.32 (σκορπισθῆτε ἐκαστος εἰς τὰ ἤδια), as ἐκαστος εἰς τὰ ἤδια shows, is an allusion to Isa. 53.6 and thus the Palestinian exegesis of נִפְרָא (—we were scattered), preserved in the *Targ.*, is used.<sup>420</sup> Finally, with regard to the quotation John 12.38 (=Isa. 53.1 LXX), what is striking is the fact that the quotation immediately following in v. 40 (=Isa. 6.10) follows a different technique of translation,<sup>421</sup> even the introductory formulae are different. Since the introduction to the second quotation (John 12.40) reveals a typically Johannine style,<sup>422</sup> the first (12.38) may be traditional in form and content.<sup>423</sup> In fact Rom. 10.16 confirms the traditional character of the quotation from Isa. 53.1.

<sup>416</sup>Recently: R. Bultmann, 'Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im 1. Petrusbrief', *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, XI, 1947, 1-14.

<sup>417</sup>Cullmann, 'Gesù', 55.

<sup>418</sup>On ὑψοῦν and δοξάζειν in John see n. 441.

<sup>419</sup>Cf. p. 96 below. The ὑπέρ formula also elsewhere in John, see n. 435.

<sup>420</sup>Cf. Hegermann, 8 f.

<sup>421</sup>John 12.38 follows LXX, against the Hebrew text (as the addition of κύρε shows). 12.40, on the other hand, departs completely from LXX.

<sup>422</sup>Διὸς τοῦτο . . . δτι cf. Bultmann, *Johannesevangelium* (Meyer), 1941, 346 n. 4; 177 n. 5.

<sup>423</sup>Cf. Bultmann (op. cit. in n. 422, 346), who attributes John 12.37 f. to the 'σημεῖα source' used by this evangelist. We have intentionally formulated the matter in more general terms.

## *The Servant of God in the New Testament*

(f) Paul; Matthew; Epistle to the Hebrews. In Paul, apart from the richly extant traditional material (cf. pp. 88 f.), there is to be found only one christologically interpreted 'ebed quotation—Rom. 15.21 (=Isa. 52.15 LXX). But it is characteristic that here the emphasis lies not on the christological interpretation ( $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota \alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$ ) but on the missionary task, which Paul finds prophesied in this passage from Isa. The position is quite similar in the synoptic gospels. Apart from the rich traditional material which is to be found in them too (pp. 89 f.) and with the exception of the supplement Matt. 12.21 (p. 80), we may attribute with certainty to one of the synoptic evangelists personally only the general scriptural allusion, Matt. 26.54, which is stamped by the characteristic style of Matt.<sup>424</sup> Otherwise there is only a formal allusion (cf. p. 96) to Isa. 53 in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9.28; Isa. 53.12 LXX).

The absence of allusions to the 'ebed in James, II and III John, in Jude, II Peter, and Rev.<sup>425</sup> as well as their remarkable scarcity in Paul, Hebrews, and the Gospel of John and, finally, the circumstance that the very numerous references are to be found almost without exception in the stock of old tradition and formulae—all this leads to the same conclusion as in the investigation of the phrase  $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omega\tilde{\nu}$  (p. 85): the christological interpretation of the Deutero-Isaiah servant belongs to the earliest period of the Christian community and at a very early stage became fixed in form. This result is confirmed and made precise by a further observation. A survey of all the Isaiah texts so far mentioned yields the conclusion that of the 'ebed texts of Deut. Isa. only Isa. 42.1–4, 6; 49.6; and Isa. 52.13–53.12 were interpreted messianically in the N.T. But those are the precise texts which Palestinian Judaism—as opposed to Hellenistic (pp. 52 f.)—interpreted messianically (pp. 77 f.). Hence it must be concluded that the christological

<sup>424</sup> Πῶς in direct rhetorical question with following subjunctive in the N.T. only in Matt. (23.33; 26.54); πληροῦν (of scripture) is a favourite word of Matt. (twelve times, Mark once, Luke twice, John eight times; cf. Klostermann, *Matt.* [HNT, II, 1] on 1.22). On the other hand Matt. 8.17 can hardly be attributed with Schlatter, *Matt.* to the evangelist himself, because here Isa. 53.4 is translated from the Heb. text whereas Matt. in his own scriptural quotations follows LXX.

<sup>425</sup> Rev. 1.16; 19.15 (sword out of the mouth) is not to be counted among the allusions to the 'ebed; for here the allusion is to Isa. 11.4. Isa. 49.2 is only a secondary combination with Ps. 149.6, see Schlatter, 37.

interpretation of these passages flows from the Palestinian pre-Hellenistic stage of the early church.<sup>426</sup>

(ii) *The historical setting in the life of the early church.* The result thus reached finds further confirmation and gains concrete form when we inquire into the historical setting of the christological interpretation of the 'ebed in the early church.

(a) The fundamental setting of this exegesis in the early church—if we set aside for the moment the transmission of the words of Jesus (see pp. 98 f. below)—is proof from scripture. The situation after the death of Jesus compelled the Christian community from the very first to supply a demonstration from scripture that the death on the cross was divinely ordained and possessed vicarious efficacy. That scripture proof for the death on the cross belonged to the most primitive *kerygma* and that it was carried out with the help of Isa. 53, is shown conclusively by I Cor. 15.3 (cf. p. 88). Its importance may be measured by the great number of instances and the variety of the formulae (cf. nn. 405, 414). Whereas in the majority of cases Isa. 53 is presumed to be so well known that a general reference to scripture suffices,<sup>427</sup> Acts 8.32 f. adduces a literal quotation of Isa. 53.7b–8a (LXX). What is more, the primitive (pp. 90, 80) tradition finds in Isa. 42 and 53 a prophecy of individual traits in the life of Jesus (Matt. 8.17=Isa. 53.4 Heb. text: healings of the sick; Matt. 12.18–20=Isa. 42.1–3 Heb. text: the avoidance of public notice). In Isa. 53.1 is seen a prophecy of the unbelief of Israel, in which connexion the independent agreement of Paul and the fourth gospel is to be noted (Rom. 10.16; John 12.38, see p. 92). Finally, in Isa. 52.15 Paul found prophesied his special missionary task of preaching Christ where as yet no one had heard of him (Rom. 15.21).<sup>428</sup>

(b) Thus the 'ebed of Deutero-Isaiah influenced very strongly the development of the christology of the early church. This is shown by the great number of christological predicates and formal turns of phrase which are connected with Isa. 42.1 ff. and 52.13 ff.

The following christological predicates should be men-

<sup>426</sup>Cullmann, 'Gesù', 56; the 'ebed-Yahweh christology is 'probabilmente la più antica cristologia'.

<sup>427</sup>Recently, J. Dupont, *Les problèmes du Livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents*, 1950, 110.

<sup>428</sup>Cf. further the similar reference to Isa. 42.7, 16 in Acts 26.18.

tioned: ὁ παῖς (of God) (pp. 80 f.) and perhaps connected with it: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (p. 81), ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (p. 82), and τὸ ἄρνιον (p. 83); further ὁ ἐκλεκτός (John 1.34, see n. 261), ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (Luke 9.35) with its alternative ὁ ἀγαπητός;<sup>429</sup> finally, ὁ δίκαιος, although occurring not seldom in late Jewish literature (cf. TWNT, II, 188, 23 ff.) as a messianic attribute, should, as a predicate of Jesus, be connected in the first instance with Isa. 53.11 (see pp. 91 f.).<sup>430</sup> Further, the description of Jesus as ἵλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (I John 2.2; 4.10)<sup>431</sup> rests presumably upon Isa. 53.10; his description as intercessor (I John 2.1: παράκλητος; Rom. 8.34 and Heb. 7.25: ἐντυγχάνειν) corresponds to Isa. 53.12,<sup>432</sup> on φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνῶν, see n. 403.

Among christological formulae connected with Isa. 53 the ὑπέρ formula stands first by reason of its numerical preponderance. Its origin in Isa. 53 is suggested by the link with the word πολλοί (ὑπὲρ πολλῶν Mark 14.24; περὶ πολλῶν Matt. 26.28; ἀντὶ πολλῶν Mark 10.45; Matt 20.28) which is a veritable keyword in Isa. 53, and by I Cor. 15.3 (*κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*). The great age of the ὑπέρ formula is shown by its use in the primitive *kerygma* (I Cor. 15.3) and in the eucharistic words (Mark 14.24 par.),<sup>433</sup> also by its independence of the LXX<sup>434</sup> and by the marked variation in the prepositions<sup>435</sup> arising from the

<sup>429</sup> Mark 1.11 par.; 9.7 par.; Matt. 12.18; Luke 9.35 (v.l.); II Peter 1.17. Cf. Eph. 1.6: ὁ ἡγαπημένος.

<sup>430</sup> H. Dechent, 'Der "Gerechte"—eine Bezeichnung für den Messias', TSK, 100, 1927/8, 439–43.

<sup>431</sup> ἵλασμός = ☩ Isa. 53.10 (?); on περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν cf. Isa. 53.4–6; Wolff, 104 f.

<sup>432</sup> Mowinckel (op. cit. in n. 399), 120 f. It should be noticed that Jesus, in I John 2.1, is called δίκαιος (cf. Isa. 53.11).

<sup>433</sup> With regard to the semitic linguistic character of the two traditional sections see Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118 ff. 'ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (I Cor. 15.3) is recognizable as pre-Pauline by the un-Pauline plural (*ibid.*, 129 f.).

<sup>434</sup> ὑπέρ is lacking in the LXX of Isa. 52.13–53.12; there διά with accusative (53.5 [twice], 12) and περὶ with genitive (53.4, cf. 10) are used.

<sup>435</sup> The following prepositions alternate in the statements about the death of Jesus: ἀντὶ: Mark 10.45; Matt. 20.28; ὑπέρ with genitive: Mark 14.24; Luke 22.19, 20; John 6.51; 10.11, 15; 11.51 f.; 15.13; 17.19; 18.14; Rom. 5.6, 8; 8.32; 14.15; I Cor. 1.13; 5.7 (v.l.); 11.24; 15.3; II Cor. 5.14, 15 (twice, 21; Gal. 1.4; 2.20; 3.13; Eph. 5.2, 25; I Thess. 5.10 (v.l.); I Tim. 2.6; Titus 2.14; Heb. 2.9; 10.12 (cf. 26); I Peter 2.21; 3.18; 4.1 (v.l.); I John 3.16; περὶ with genitive: Matt. 26.28; Rom. 8.3; I Cor. 1.13 (v.l.); Gal. 1.4 (v.l.); I Thess. 5.10; I Peter 3.18; I John 2.2; 4.10; διά with accusative: Rom. 3.25; 4.25; I Cor. 8.11. It is not a matter of chance that in many of these passages the use of formal data can be recognized also by other indications.

varied translations of the semitic text which lay behind it.<sup>436</sup> Also the formal use of *παραδιδόναι* in the passive (replacing the divine name) for the purpose of indicating the passion of Jesus<sup>437</sup> is probably connected with Isa. 53;<sup>438</sup> διδόναι τὴν ψυχήν (Mark 10.45; Matt. 20.28), τιθέναι τὴν ψυχήν (John 10.11, 15, 17, 18), διδόναι ἑαυτόν (Gal. 1.4; I Tim. 2.6; Titus 2.14), *παραδιδόναι* ἑαυτόν (Gal. 2.20; Eph. 5.2, 25) are most probably mere translation variants of *נִפְשַׁת יְמֵינוּ* (Isa. 53.10 Heb. text) and *הַנִּשְׁאָר נִפְשָׁת* (*מִסְרָר*) (53.12 Aram.). Frequently we find the (*παρα*)-διδόναι formula linked with the ὑπέρ formula and its variants.<sup>439</sup> Further, the expression taken from Isa. 53.12 αἰρεῖν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν (John 1.29; plural I John 3.5) or ἀναφέρειν ἀμαρτίας (Heb. 9.28; I Peter 2.24),<sup>440</sup> probably also the phrase ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν (I Peter 2.22) or ἀμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν (I John 3.5),<sup>441</sup> echoing Isa. 53.9b, are of a formal character. The variety of the attempts to render in Greek the Hebrew *נִפְשָׁת* (Isa. 53.10) shows the early and strong influence of Isa. 53 upon the christology of the early church.<sup>442</sup>

(c) Further, liturgy is to be taken into account. In the celebration of the eucharist, the πολλῶν of the liturgical words of the last supper (Mark 14.24 par.) referred to the servant, and the old liturgical prayer formula διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου lives on with

<sup>436</sup>Specially clear examples of variants in the translation are furnished by Mark 10.45 par. (ἀντὶ πολλῶν) compared with I Tim. 2.6 (ὑπὲρ πάντων); Mark 14.24 (ὑπὲρ πολλῶν) compared with Matt. 26.28 (περὶ πολλῶν).

<sup>437</sup>Mark 9.31 par; 10.33 par.; 14.41 par.; Matt. 26.2; Luke 24.7; Rom. 4.25; I Cor. 11.23.

<sup>438</sup>Isa. 53.5 *Targ.*: *רַבְמַחְנָן*; 53.12 LXX: *παρεδόθη* (twice). Especially clear is the connexion of the N.T. statements with Isa. 53.12 LXX in those texts where the passive *παραδιδόναι* is used absolutely: Rom. 4.25; I Cor. 11.23.

<sup>439</sup>Luke 22.19; Rom. 4.25; 8.32; Gal. 1.4; 2.20; Eph. 5.2, 25; I Tim. 2.6; Titus 2.14.

<sup>440</sup>John 1.29; I John 3.5 follow Isa. 53.12 (Heb. text), on the other hand Heb. 9.28; I Peter 2.24 use Isa. 53.12 (LXX).

<sup>441</sup>Cf. further τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἀμαρτίαν II Cor. 5.21. It cannot be said with certainty whether the formal use of the verbs ὑψοῦν, Acts 2.33; 5.31; John 3.14; 8.28; 12.32, 34 and δοξάζειν, Acts 3.13; John 7.39; 12.16, 23; 17.1, 5 and elsewhere, is connected with Isa. 52.13 LXX (thus O. Michel, 'Probleme der neutestamentlichen Theologie', *DT*, 9, 1942, 29; Wolff, 85; Cerfaux, 123, n. 1).

<sup>442</sup>Ἄντερον: Mark 10.45; Matt. 20.28 (Dalman op. cit. in n. 304, 110; cf. Wolff, 61; Jeremias, 'Lösegeld', 262), changed to ἀντίλυτρον in I Tim. 2.6; περὶ ἀμαρτίας (=LXX Isa. 53.10) Rom. 8.3; probably also Ἰλαστήριον, see n. 399; for Ἰλασμός see n. 431.

great persistence in the eucharistic prayer and in the doxology (pp. 83 f.).<sup>443</sup> From pre-Pauline times (see n. 398 on Phil. 2.6–11) Jesus is also extolled in psalms as the servant of God (Phil. 2.6–11; I Peter 2.22–25; Luke 2.32, cf. Rom. 4.25).

The connexion of Phil. 2.6–11 with Isa. 53<sup>444</sup> becomes plain as soon as it is recognized that not the LXX but the Heb. text of Isa. 53 is used; even the use of δοῦλος (instead of παῖς) loses its strangeness (see n. 444) when it is recognized that we have here a direct rendering of the Hebrew עָבֵד (Isa. 52.13). The decisive proof of the connexion of Phil. 2.6–11 with Isa. 53 lies in the fact that the expression ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (Phil. 2.7), attested nowhere else in the Greek and grammatically extremely harsh, is an exact rendering of נִפְשׁוּ . . . הַעֲרָה (Isa. 53.12).<sup>445</sup> Apart from other verbal echoes,<sup>446</sup> allusion to Isa. 53 is to be seen further in the antithesis of extreme meekness and exaltation, in the willingness to be humbled and in the mention of obedience and of death.<sup>447</sup> The hymn to Christ (I Peter 2.22–25)

<sup>443</sup>Cf. further the eucharistic epiclesis of the church order of Hippolytus (v. Harnack, 227 f., H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 1926, 80 f.) and the eucharistic liturgy of a Berlin papyrus not yet edited, in which it is said ‘may the eucharist serve εἰς φάρμακον ἀθανασίας . . . διὸ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδός’, H. Lietzmann, *ibid.*, 257 n. 2.

<sup>444</sup>Affirmed by, among others, Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, 32 f., 35 ff., 40–42, and H. Windisch in the discussion on the point, *TLZ*, 54, 1929, 247; Kittel, *TWNT*, I, 225 34–37; Euler, 45, 47 f., 101, 103, 118; H. Wheeler Robinson (*loc. cit.* in n. 445); Stählin, *TWNT*, III, 354; Cerfaux, 117–24; G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, 1947, 193 f.; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 274; Cullmann, ‘Gesù’, 58; Schelkle, 95. The contesting of this connexion of Phil. 2.6 ff. with Isa. 53, in K. H. Rengstorff *TWNT*, II, 281 f. and Gewiess, 56 n. 149, turns upon the word δοῦλος, Phil. 2.7, in place of which παῖς would be expected. The connexion has been most recently disputed by E. Käsemann, ‘Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2.5–11’, *ZTK*, 47, 1950, 313–60.

<sup>445</sup>Recognized by H. Wheeler Robinson, ‘The Cross of the Servant’, in *The Cross in the Old Testament*, 1955, p. 57, 104–105. הַעֲרָה means ‘to expose’, ‘to pour out’, ‘empty’; κενοῦν ‘to drain to the dregs’, ‘to pour out generously’. The use of Isa. 53.12 shows that the expression implies the surrender of life, not the *kenosis* of the incarnation.

<sup>446</sup>With μορφή (Phil. 2.6, 7) is perhaps to be compared the rendering of תְּאֵן (Isa. 52.14) with μορφή by ’A (see *TWNT*, IV, 759 n. 53); with ἐταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν (Phil. 2.8), cf. the rendering of מִתְּנַפֵּת (Isa. 53.4) by ταπεινοῦν in ’A, Σ, and Θ; regarding ὑπήκοος (Phil. 2.8) cf. the rendering of נִגְזַּע (Isa. 53.7) with ὑπήκουσεν by Σ (according to Eus.); with διό (Phil. 2.9) cf. לֹכֶד (Isa. 53.12); with ὑπερύψωσεν (Phil. 2.9) cf. מִאֵן נִגְזַּע (Isa. 52.13).

<sup>447</sup>Cf. further Cerfaux, 117–24.

(p. 91) is simply a short summary of Isa. 53; it shows how Jesus is regarded wholly from the point of view of the suffering servant. The song of praise of Simeon (Luke 2.29-32) takes up Isa. 49.6 (cf. n. 403) and refers this servant passage to Jesus.

(d) Finally, Isa. 53 plays a great part in primitive Christian paraenesis and the literature of martyrdom. Jesus as the suffering servant of God is put forward, as the context shows, as the pattern of service (Mark 10.45 par.), of selflessness (Phil. 2.5-11), of willing innocent suffering (I Peter 2.21-25) and of humility (I Cl. 16.1-17). In particular, the martyr is the perfect imitator of the servant (Ignatius, *Eph.* 10.3; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* V 1.23; V 2.2).<sup>448</sup>

The result is that there is no area of the primitive Christian life of faith which was not stamped and moulded by the 'ebed christology. Its impact, to be observed equally throughout all areas in formal phrases, enables us to appreciate the antiquity and the deep roots of the 'ebed christology and explains the infrequency of express quotations (pp. 88, 94). But if the application of the title παῖς θεοῦ to Jesus, as also the christological interpretation of Isa. 42.1 ff.; 49.6, and especially 52.13 ff. belongs to the oldest Palestinian stage of the early church, the question then arises:

### 3. CAN JESUS HAVE KNOWN HIMSELF TO BE THE SERVANT OF GOD?

The gospels say so. In the following places they make Jesus apply to himself the Deut. Isa. servant passages

Mark 2.20 par.: ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν, cf. Isa. 53.8: חֶלְקָה(?).<sup>449</sup>

Mark 9.12: ἔξουδενηθῇ, cf. Isa. 53.3: נִבְאַת ('Α, Σ, Θ ἔξουδενωμένος).

Luke 11.22: καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαβίδωσιν, cf. Isa. 53.12 קְלַיְלָשׁ (LXX μεριεῖ σκῦλα)(?).<sup>450</sup> Mark 10.45 par. Matt. 20.28: διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, cf. Isa. 53.10 שָׁפֵךְ אֶסְמָשָׁים אֲשֶׁר; 53.11, 12: לְבִים; διακονῆσαι is an

<sup>448</sup>Cerfau, 128 f. With regard to the wide use of Isa. 53 in post-N.T. literature, especially in Justin, see Wolff, 108-42, further *TWNT*, III, 553ff.

<sup>449</sup>An allusion is accepted among others by Lohmeyer, *Markus*<sup>2</sup>, 1950, ad loc.; Schelkle, 62; Buber, 72.

<sup>450</sup>*TWNT*, III, 403, 25 ff. Yet it remains possible that in Luke 11.21 f. par. there is present an image which is independent of the O.T. (thus W. Bieder, *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfabrik Jesu Christi*, 1949, 35).

*The Servant of God in the New Testament*

allusion to the servant. λύτρον must be a free translation of שָׁמַן (in the common<sup>451</sup> meaning of ‘compensation’).<sup>452</sup> Mark 14.8: Jesus expects to be buried as a criminal, without anointing, cf. Isa. 53.9. Mark 14.24 par.: ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, cf. Isa. 53.12: רְבִים . . . הַעֲרָה.<sup>453</sup> Luke 22.37: δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη = Isa. 53.12: אֶת־פְּשֻׁעֵינוּמָה. Mark 14.61 par. Matt. 26.63: Jesus is silent before the Sanhedrin; Mark 15.5 par. Matt. 27.12 and 14; John 19.9: before Pilate; Luke 23.9: before Herod Antipas, cf. Isa. 53.7 לְאַלְמָנָה.<sup>454</sup> Luke 23.34: Jesus makes intercession, cf. Isa. 53.12.<sup>455</sup> John 10.11, 15, 17f.: τιθέναι τὴν ψυχήν, cf. Isa. 53.10: וְנִפְשֹׁׁר . . . שְׂדֵךְ. P. Oxy. I, 1 recto 19 f.: πονεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου, cf. Isa. 53.11: מַעֲמֵל נִפְשֹׁׁר and the LXX: ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ.<sup>456</sup> Finally must be mentioned the many references to scripture which Jesus makes (see n. 405); concerning their connexion with Isa. 53 see p. 90.

Many of these passages are wholly or in part the work of the church (on Mark 2.20 see TWNT, IV, 1096, 19 ff.);<sup>457</sup> with regard to the silence of Jesus before his judges (Sanhedrin, Pilate, Herod) what strikes one is the fact that this detail is repeatedly reported (see above);<sup>458</sup> the predictions of the passion, especially, reveal, on comparison, a secondary tendency to assume concrete features and to become assimilated to the actual

<sup>451</sup>Cf. K. G. Kuhn ‘Die Abendmahlsworte’, TLZ, 75, 1950, 406 n. 2.

<sup>452</sup>For the reference to Isa. 53 cf. Dalman (op. cit. in n. 304), 110; Wolff, 61; Jeremias, ‘Lösegeld’, 262.

<sup>453</sup>Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 148 ff. For Jesus’ own comparison of himself with the paschal lamb (*ibid.* 144) cf. Isa. 53.7.

<sup>454</sup>H. W. Surkau, *Martyrien in jüdischer und fröbchristlicher Zeit*, 1938, 87; J. Schniewind, *Mark* (N. T. Deutsch) on 14.61. On Mark 14.62 par. Matt. 26.64 δψεσθε cf. further Isa. 52.15.

<sup>455</sup>This intercession is for unwitting sinners, cf. Isa. 53.10: שְׁמַן is the sacrifice for unwitting sins. (Luke 23.34a is missing in one part of the manuscripts and might well be a very old addition resting upon authoritative tradition.)

<sup>456</sup>Cf. A. v. Harnack, *Über die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, 1897, 13; J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte*, 1951, 70.

<sup>457</sup>Yet in view of the widespread idea of the snatching away of the Messiah (*Eth. En.* 70.1; Rev. 12.5; II Esd. [IV Ezra] 13.1–13, 25–52 compared with 12.31 f., 14.9 [S.-B., II, 334; Dalman, *WJ*, I, 397, German ed.]; *Syr. Bar.* 30.1; *J. Ber* 2.4 [5a 25 f.] and elsewhere) we shall have to reckon with the possibility that Mark 2.20 goes back to ‘a genuine tradition which, however, it is no longer possible to reconstruct’ (Buber, 72).

<sup>458</sup>Cf. Wolff, 76 n.316 (following J. Schniewind). On the other hand the historicity is supported by the consideration that we should expect a scriptural reference (to Isa. 53.7) if the silence of Jesus was merely drawn from this passage.

course of history.<sup>459</sup> Some observations on the texts forbid us, however, to declare spurious the whole of the references of Jesus himself to the 'ebed'.<sup>460</sup>

The assertion of the Gospels that Jesus reckoned with the possibility of a violent death has the strongest historical probability behind it. First, the whole situation compelled him to recognize it. The reproach of βλασφημία (Mark 2.7 par.; John 10.33–36, cf. 5.18) meant the threat of stoning<sup>461</sup> with subsequent hanging of the body on the cross.<sup>462</sup> The same punishment (without subsequent hanging) was incurred by Sabbath-breaking (*Sanh.* 7.4, 8); of the two sabbath stories in Mark 2.23–3.7a the first reports the warning,<sup>463</sup> as a result of which any repetition of the transgression would be proved to be intentional and punishable; in 3.1 ff. therefore, Jesus is risking his life (cf. 3.6) and has to save himself by flight (3.7a: ἀνεχώρησεν).<sup>464</sup> The reports that Jesus repeatedly stood in immediate danger of stoning,<sup>465</sup> in view of Mark 2.23–3.7a, are wholly within the sphere of the possible. Second, the historical facts must have compelled Jesus to reckon with the possibility of death by violence. Jesus, in words which represent particularly authentic

<sup>459</sup> Thus Mark has μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας (8.31; 9.31; 10.34) while Matthew and Luke in the par. texts have changed, completely independently of each other (Schelkle, 66) and *ex eventu*, to τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (or τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ). Or compare Mark 10.34, ἀποκτενοῦσσιν, with the par. Matt. 20.19, σταυρῶσσιν. Especially the so-called third prediction of the passion (more correctly, the third version of the prediction) in Mark 10.33 f. par. might well have been touched up *ex eventu* (as a comparison with the first two versions of 8.31 and 9.31 leads one to suppose) yet at the same time it should not be overlooked that Mark 10.33 f. contains no feature which could not normally be expected in capital proceedings against Jesus when we take into account the state of the law, and execution customs. This constitutes a warning to be cautious with a judgement of '*ex eventu*'.

<sup>460</sup> Thus Luke 11.22 is older than the dogmatics of the early church because the victory of Jesus over the satanic, demonic powers is associated not with the cross and resurrection but with the temptation of Jesus, cf. *TWNT*, III, 404, 28 ff.; but the connexion of the text with Isa. 53 is not certain (see n. 450).

<sup>461</sup> *Sanh.* 7.4; *Siphre Lev.* 24.11ff. (53a 31 ff. Venice ed., 1545); John 10.31, 33.

<sup>462</sup> *Sanh.* 6.4. 'All who are stoned are hanged'—words of R. Eli'ezer (b. Hyrcanos, circa A.D. 90, the representative of the older tradition). According to the *halaka* (*ibid.*) this applies only to the blasphemer and idolator.

<sup>463</sup> With regard to the warning in late Jewish law and in the N.T. cf. K. Bornhäuser, 'Zur Perikope vom Bruch des Sabbats', *NKZ*, 33, 1922, 325–34; J. Jeremias (op. cit. in n. 410), 208–13. Οὐκ ἔξεστιν Mark 2.24 is a formula of warning, cf. John 5.10.

<sup>464</sup> Mark 3.7a has a par. in Matt. 15.21 and might originally have been the end of the pericope, Mark 3.1–6.

<sup>465</sup> Luke 4.29; John 8.59; 10.31–36; 11.8; *Unknown Gospel* (Brit. Mus.) fragment I recto line 23 f., cf. Matt. 23.37 par.

## *The Servant of God in the New Testament*

tradition,<sup>466</sup> classed himself among the prophets,<sup>467</sup> and expected the fate of the prophets, viz., martyrdom (Luke 13.33; Matt. 23.34–36 par., 37 par.).<sup>468</sup> We know from the N.T.<sup>469</sup> and Jewish legend<sup>470</sup> about the prophets to what a large extent, even by the time of Jesus, martyrdom was considered to be an integral part of the prophetic calling.<sup>471</sup> Jesus himself found in sacred history an uninterrupted succession of martyrdoms of the just from Abel to Zachariah (Matt. 23.35 par.). In particular, recent history, the fate of John the Baptist, the last prophet, foreshadowed to Jesus his own destiny (Mark 9.12 f. par.; cf. 6.16; Luke 13.31). A third observation may be added as an indication of the historical value of the suggestions that Jesus reckoned with the possibility of a violent death. Jesus' predictions of his passion contain a number of features which did not materialize. Jesus at times seems to have thought it possible, presumably on the basis of concrete experiences (cf. p. 100), that he would be stoned (Matt. 23.37 par.) by the Jews as a false prophet (Luke 13.33). This expectation, like that of burial as a criminal (Mark 14.8 par.), was not fulfilled. The same applies to the expectation that some of his disciples would have to share his fate (Mark 10.32–40 par., Luke 14.25–33); curiously enough the Jewish authorities were content with the execution of Jesus and left the disciples undisturbed.<sup>472</sup>

But if Jesus reckoned with his violent death, then he must have had thoughts about the meaning of that death, especially in view

<sup>466</sup>R. Bernheimer, 'Vitae Prophetarum', *JAO*, 55, 1935, 202 f.

<sup>467</sup>Likewise Jesus places his disciples among the prophets: Matt. 5.12 par.

<sup>468</sup>The authenticity of these words is suggested above all by the fact that the early Church only occasionally placed Jesus among the prophets.

<sup>469</sup>References in N.T. to the killing of prophets: Matt. 21.35 f.; 22.6; 23.30–32 par., 34–36 par., 37 par.; Luke 13.33; Acts 7.51 f.; Rom. 11.3; I Thess. 2.15; Heb. 11.35–38; Rev. 11.7; 16.6; 18.24; cf. Jas. 5.10.

<sup>470</sup>*Prophetarum vitae fabulosae*, ed. Th. Schermann, 1907; *The Lives of the Prophets*, ed. C. C. Torrey, *JBL Monograph Series* I, 1946; M. R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, Translation of Early Documents, Series I, 1920; Josephus, *Ant.*, 10.38; Origen, *Commentariorum series* 28, on Matt. 23. 37–39 (G.C.S. 38, 50) and Katenen-Fr. 457 II on Matt. 23.29–35 (G.C.S. 41, 190); Tertullian, *Scorpiae* 8 (Migne, *PL* 2, 137 B); *Ast. Isa.* 2.16, 5.1–14; *Paral. Jer.* 9.21–32; S.-B., I, 940–2, III, 747; H. Vincent and F. M. Abel, *Jérusalem*, II, 1926, 855–74.

<sup>471</sup>A. Schlatter, 'Der Märtyrer in den Anfängen der Kirche,' *BFT*, 19.3, 1915, 18–22; O. Michel, 'Prophet und Märtyrer', *BFT*, 37.2, 1932; H. J. Schoeps, *Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde* (*Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, 2), 1943; H. A. Fischel, 'Prophet and Martyr', *JQR*, 37, 1947, 265–80, 363–86, especially 279, 382.

<sup>472</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*<sup>7</sup>, 1946, 59. The Good Friday despair of the disciples is thus no compelling objection to the historicity of the predictions of

of the extraordinary significance which the doctrine of the expiatory efficacy of death possessed for late Judaism.<sup>473</sup> The assertion of the sources that Jesus found in Isa. 53 the clue to the necessity and meaning of his passion can also claim strong historical probability. In general terms it may be pointed out here that Isa. 40 ff. possessed great significance for Jesus' consciousness of exalted mission (cf. Matt. 11.5 par.; 5.3 f.; Mark 11.17; Luke 4.18 ff. See *TWNT*, II, 706, 10 ff.; 715, 8 ff.). The allusions to Isa. 53 thus fit into the framework of his preaching and use of scripture. If now we examine the passages quoted on pp. 98 f. in detail, four observations speak for their ancient date. First, we are here in the presence of pre-Hellenistic tradition; for none of these texts, except Luke 22.37 (but see n. 404), shows the unequivocal influence of the LXX, which on the contrary is impossible for Mark 9.12; 10.45; 14.8, 24; Luke 23.34; John 10.11, 15, 17 f. Mark 9.31 gives an Aramaic word-play: בָּר נַשְׁא/בָּנִי נַשְׁא. The religious use of λύτρον (Mark 10.45 par.) is Jewish.<sup>474</sup> Luke 23.34 also presupposes Palestinian circumstances; for late Judaism the expiatory vow of the criminal is a formal part of the execution ('May my death expiate all my sins'),<sup>475</sup> which Jesus, like the Maccabaeans<sup>476</sup> martyrs, reverses, but so as to transfer the expiatory virtue of his death to his tormentors (see n. 455). Second, several of the predictions of the passion are couched in such general terms that they could not well have been shaped *ex eventu*: Mark 9.12b (cf. Isa. 53.3 and see n. 406); Luke 9.44; 12.50<sup>477</sup>; 13.32 f.; 17.25. Also the absence of any mention of Easter in these passages

---

the passion, because it was essentially rooted in the fact that the course of events contradicted the expectations which the disciples entertained as a result of the preaching of Jesus as a whole. They clearly expected indeed suffering and martyrdom both for Jesus and themselves (Mark 10.39 par.; 14.29 par.), but immediately following it a 'corporate triumph' (Luke 24.21; Acts 1.6, cf. T. W. Manson, 'The New Testament Basis of the Doctrine of the Church', *JEH*, I, 1950, 6, and n. 3). As regards the lack of understanding on the part of the disciples, see n. 331.

<sup>473</sup> Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 151 f.

<sup>474</sup> Jeremias, 'Lösegeld', 249–58. In contrast to the Palestinian character of the language in Mark 10.42–45, the par. Luke 22.24–27 shows strong Hellenistic influence, *ibid.* 258–62.

<sup>475</sup> Sanh. 6.2; T. Sanh. 9.5; B. Sanh. 44b; J. Sanh. 6.4 (23b 47), cf. A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement*, 1928, 170, n. 4; K. G. Kuhn, 'Rom. 6.7', *ZNW*, 30, 1931, 306.

<sup>476</sup> IV Mac. 6.29; II Mac. 7.37 f.

<sup>477</sup> Buber, 77 n. 2; 'it is impossible to imagine how the words could have originated in the early church'.

(also in Mark 14.8; Luke 22.37) is an argument against their invention by the early church.<sup>478</sup> Third, some of the words are so firmly anchored in the context that they cannot be detached from it. This is particularly true of the *logion* Mark 8.31, which is indissolubly bound up with the sharp rebuke to Peter (8.33); this description of Peter as Satan cannot have been subsequently added to the discourse of Jesus. The expectation, too, of a criminal's burial without anointing (Mark 14.8) is firmly rooted in the context. This becomes plain as soon as we recognize that in the pericope Mark 14.3–9 almsgiving (*הַקְרָדֶת צְדִיקָה* 14.5) and the work of love (*תְּמִילָה חֲסִידִים* 14.6)<sup>479</sup> are contrasted with each other, and that only the information given in 14.8 as to which of the offices of love the anointing woman has unconsciously performed for Jesus (viz., the burial of the dead) provides us with the clue to the whole.<sup>480</sup> Similarly fixed to the context is Luke 22.37. This word, which is an allusion to the Heb. text of Isa. 53.12 (see n. 404), and makes no reference to Easter (see p. 102), stands between the two quite obviously ancient words about the swords (vv. 36, 38) of which the first, v. 36, announces the imminent outbreak of the eschatological time of distress and to this extent is an unfulfilled prophecy. The reason given in v. 37 for this announcement—that, because Jesus will be driven out of the community of Israel as an ἀνόμος, so his disciples, too, will be treated as ἀνόμοι and refused food and their lives threatened<sup>481</sup>—is indispensable to the whole context. Mark 9.12b is also to be mentioned here. If, as is probable (cf. TWNT, II, 939, 22 ff.), the disciples in Mark 9.11 cite the Elijah prophecy (Mal. 4.5 f.) as an objection to Jesus' prediction of his passion—the restoration of all things which Elijah is to accomplish three days before the end makes messianic suffering superfluous—then the word about suffering (Mark 9.12b) is here, too, essential to the context. Fourth, it is of decisive importance that at one point of the oldest and most reliable stratum of tradi-

<sup>478</sup> Further, Buber, 71, on Luke 17.25: genuineness is suggested by the fact that the manner of the link between the hidden present and the future revelation remains uncertain. This point of view has importance also for Luke 13.32 (*τελειοῦμαι*).

<sup>479</sup> Concerning alms and the works of love cf. S.-B., IV, 536–610.

<sup>480</sup> Jeremias, 'Die Salbungsgeschichte Marc. 14.3–9', ZNW, 35, 1936, 75–82. The genuineness of Mark 14.8 is supported also by the fact that we have here an unfulfilled prophecy (cf. p. 99). Jesus was spared a dishonourable burial (Mark 15.45 f., John 19.38 ff.).

<sup>481</sup> Schlatter, *Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinen Quellen erklärt*, 1931, 428.

tion we come upon Isa. 53: in the eucharistic words of Jesus (Mark 14.24 par.: ὑπὲρ πολλῶν). Paul received his version of the eucharistic words which he passed on to the Corinthians (I Cor. 11.23-25) in A.D. 49-50, in a Hellenistic environment,<sup>482</sup> probably circa 40 in Antioch.<sup>483</sup> Since the Marcan version proves itself older than the Pauline on account, among other things, of its numerous semitic features,<sup>484</sup> it takes us back to the thirties. Here, therefore, we have before us the bedrock of the tradition.

The fact that the number of texts in which Jesus relates Isa. 53 to himself is not great, and that they are altogether absent in the *logia* peculiar to Matt. and Luke, must be connected with the fact that Jesus only allowed himself to be known as the servant in his esoteric and not in his public preaching.<sup>485</sup> Only to his disciples did he unveil the mystery that he viewed the fulfilment of Isa. 53 as his God-appointed task,<sup>486</sup> and to them alone did he interpret his death as a vicarious dying for the countless multitude (see article πολὺς, *TWNT*, s.v.) of those who lay under the judgement of God (Mark 10.45; 14.24). Because he goes to his death innocently, voluntarily, patiently and in accordance with the will of God (Isa. 53) his dying has boundless atoning virtue. It is life flowing from God, and life in God<sup>487</sup> which he outpours.

<sup>482</sup> J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 127.

<sup>483</sup> Antioch is suggested by the relationship between the Pauline and the Lucan representation (Luke 22.19b-20a agrees almost literally with I Cor. 11.24 f.; see J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 131).

<sup>484</sup> For semitisms in Mark 14.22-25 see J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 118 ff. In addition some factual considerations, *ibid.* 106 ff. As regards the ὑπέρ phrase in particular, the Pauline ὑπέρ ὑμῶν (I Cor. 11.24) is certainly secondary as compared with the ὑπέρ πολλῶν of Mark 14.24; for Paul avoids the πολλῶν semitism (see article πολὺς, *TWNT*, s.v.), and under the influence of liturgical custom the theological exegesis (in the third person) has become a distribution formula (in the second person). Besides this the Pauline association of the ὑπέρ phrase with the bread is shown to be secondary as opposed to the Marcan association with the cup on account of the linguistically very strange, and in Aramaic impossible (Dalman, *Jesus-Jesuba*, 144 f.) expression τὸ ὑπέρ ὑμῶν (I Cor. 11.24). This strangeness suggests the conclusion that the ὑπέρ phrase, with omission of the participle ἐχυννόμενος (cf. also John 6.51c), became associated with the bread (for conjectures about the reasons see J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 110, 128).

<sup>485</sup> Most recently Buber, 74.

<sup>486</sup> Most recently Buber, 73 f. 'If we see the connexion rightly, Jesus, under the influence of Deut. Isa. conception, understood himself as the bearer of the messianic hiddenness.' *Ibid.* 77: 'The picture of the servant, modified by apocalyptic' (through the combination with the son of man) has entered 'into the actual life history of Jesus'.

<sup>487</sup> J. Schniewind, *Mark* (N.T. Deutsch) on 10.45.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Chapter 1

- W. W. Baudissin, 'Zur Entwicklung des Gebrauchs von 'ebed in religiösem Sinne' in *Festschrift K. Budde* (*ZAW*, Beiheft 34), 1920, 1-9  
W. W. Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname*, *TWNT*, III, 1929, 176-242, 524-55  
J. Begrich, 'Das priesterliche Heilsorakel', *ZAW*, 52, 1934, 81-92  
J. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja* (*BWANT*, 4.25), 1938, esp. 131-151  
A. Bentzen, *Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn* (Abh. zur Theologie des A. und N.T. 17), 1948  
K. Budde, *Die sogenannten Ebed-Jahve-Lieder und die Bedeutung des Knechtes Jahves in Js 40-55*, 1900  
K. Budde, *Das Buch Jesaja Kap. 40-66* (in Kautzsch HSAT<sup>4</sup>), 1922  
E. Burrows, 'The Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah' in *The Gospel of the Infancy and other Biblical Essays*, 1940  
B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*<sup>4</sup>, 1922  
L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der isr.-jüdischen Heilandserwartung*, 1925, 125-52  
O. Eissfeldt, 'Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja im Lichte der israelitischen Anschaugung von Gemeinschaft und Individuum', 1933 (E.Tr. in *ET*, 44, 261-68)  
K. Elliger, *Deutero-Jesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Trito-Jesaja* (*BWANT*, 4.11), 1933  
I. Engnell, 'The "Ebed-Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in "Deutero-Isaiah"', *BJRL*, 31.1, 1948  
F. Giesebricht, *Der Knecht Jahves des Deutero-Jesaja*, 1902  
H. Gressmann, 'Die literarische Analyse Deutero-Jesajas', *ZAW*, 34, 1914, 254-97  
H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der isr.-jüdischen Eschatologie*, 1905, 301-33  
H. Gressmann, *Der Messias*, 1929, 287-339; index s.v. 'Ebed Jahveh  
J. Hempel, 'Vom irrenden Glauben', *ZST*, 7, 1930, 631-60  
L. Köhler, *Deutero-Jesaja stilkritisch untersucht* (*ZAW*, Beiheft 37), 1937  
C. Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the O.T.*, 1950  
S. Mowinckel, *Der Knecht Jahwäs*, 1921  
S. Mowinckel, 'Die Komposition des deutero-jesajanischen Buches', *ZAW*, 49, 1931, 87-112, 242-60  
C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 1948  
H. Wheeler Robinson, 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality', in *Werden und Wesen des AT*, ed. J. Hempel (*ZAW*, Beiheft 66), 1936, 49-62. See *The Cross in the O.T.*, 1955, 65-80  
W. Rudolph, 'Der exilische Messias', *ZAW*, 43, 1925, 90-114  
E. Sellin, *Serubbabel*, 1898  
E. Sellin, *Mose und seine Bedeutung für die isr.-jüdische Religionsgeschichte*, 1922, 77-113  
E. Sellin, 'Die Lösung des deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtsrätsels', *ZAW*, 55, 1937, 177-217  
N. H. Snaith, 'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah', *Studies in O.T. Prophecy, Festschrift T. H. Robinson*, 1950, 187-200  
J. J. Stamm, *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel*, 1946  
P. Volz, *Jesaja II* (Kommentar zum AT, IX, 2), 1932  
H. W. Wolff, *Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum*, 2nd ed. 1950  
J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur LXX des Buches Isaias*, 1934

### Chapter 2

- K. F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht* (*BWANT*, 4.14), 1934  
J. Ziegler, *'Isaias', Septuaginta XIV*, 1939

## Bibliography

### Chapter 3

- R. A. Ayton, 'The Servant of the Lord in the Targum', *JTS*, 23, 1922, 172-80
- P. Billerbeck, 'Hat die alte Synagoge einen präexistenten Messias gekannt?', *Nathanael*, 21, 1905, 89-150
- J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ*, I, 1934, 380-85
- W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 2nd ed., 1921, 56-57, 60-74
- J. J. Brierre-Narbonne, *Le Messie souffrant dans la Littérature rabbinique*, 1940
- M. Buber, 'Jesus und der "Knecht"', *Festschrift G. van der Leeuw, Pro Regno, pro Sanctuario*, 1950, 71-78; see *Two Types of Faith*
- R. Bultmann, 'Reich Gottes und Menschensohn', *TR, NF* 9, 1937, 26-30
- G. Dalman, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagoge im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrtausend* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Berlin 4), 1888; quoted as: Dalman, I
- G. Dalman, *Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Stühnleiden des Gottesknechtes*<sup>a</sup> (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Berlin 13), 1914; quoted as: Dalman, II
- W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1948, 274-84
- S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, I, II, 1876-7
- H. A. Fischel, 'Die deuterokesajanischen Gottesknechtlieder in der jüdischen Auslegung', *HUCA* 18, 1943-4, 53-76
- H. Hegermann, *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta*, 1954
- P. Humbert, 'Le Messie dans le Targum des prophètes', *RTP*, 43, 1910, 420-47; 44, 1911, 5-46
- J. Jeremias, 'Erlöser und Erlösung im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum', *DT*, II, 1929, 106-19
- J. Jeremias, «Ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ-παῖς θεοῦ», *ZNW*, 34, 1935, 115-23
- N. Johansson, *Parakletoi*, 1940, 96-119
- G. Kittel, 'Menschensohn', *RGG*<sup>a</sup>, III, 2118-21
- J. Leisegang, *Index = Philonis Opera*, ed. Cohn and Wendland, Vol. VII, 1926-30
- W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, 1943, 99, 171 ff.
- G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I (1927), 229, 549-51; III (1930), 63, 166
- H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*, 1928
- R. Otto, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*<sup>a</sup>, 1940, 118-209; E. Tr. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*<sup>a</sup>, 1943
- H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus Transfiguré* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 16), 1947, 81-96, 307-17
- H. H. Rowley, 'The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah', *OTS*, VIII, 1950, 100-36
- A. Schlatter, 'Das AT in der joh. Apokalypse', *BFT*, 16, 6, 1912, 50 ff.
- A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*, 1932; quoted as: Schl. Theol. d. Judt.
- A. Schlatter, *Markus. Der Evangelist für die Griechen*, 1935
- H. J. Schoeps, 'Symachusstudien III', *Biblica*, 29, 1948, 31-51; V, 'Der aussätzige Messias', 38 f.
- P. Seidelin, 'Der 'Ebed Jahwe und die Messiasgestalt im Jesajatargum', *ZNW*, 35, 1936, 194-231
- E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äth. Henocbuch* (Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensium 41), 1946, 116-39
- W. Staerk, *Soter* (BFT, 2nd series, 31), 1933, 72-84
- W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen*, 1938, 406-8
- J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah*, 1949
- H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 5th ed., 1921
- C. C. Torrey, 'The Messiah Son of Ephraim', *JBL*, 66, 1947, 253-77
- F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, 2nd ed., 1897
- A. Wünsche, *יטורי המשיח oder die Leiden des Messias*, 1870

## Bibliography

### Chapter 4

- H. O. Bauernfeind, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1939, on 3.13, 26 and 4.27  
R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, E. Tr., I, II, 1953, 1955  
F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, 1924, 35–41  
C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 1922, 104–8  
H. J. Cadbury, ‘The Titles of Jesus in Acts’, in Jackson-Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, I, 5, 1933, 364–70  
L. L. Carpenter, *Primitive Christian Application of the Doctrine of the Servant*, 1929  
L. Cerfau, ‘L’hymne au Christ-Serviteur de Dieu (Phil. 2.6–11 et Isa. 52.13–53. 12)’ *Miscellanea Historica in honorem A. de Meyer* (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d’Histoire et de Philosophie, 3<sup>e</sup> série, 2<sup>e</sup> fascicule) 1946, 117–30  
O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, E. Tr. 1953  
O. Cullmann, ‘Gesù, servo di Dio (Jesuōs País Theou)’, *Protestantesimo* 3, 1948, 49–58  
O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, E. Tr. 1953  
G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, E. Tr. 1902, cited as: Dalman, *WJ*  
J. Geweiss, ‘Die Urchristliche Heilsverkündigung nach der Apostelgeschichte’, *Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie*, N.F. 5, 1939, 38–57, 75–81  
L. Goppelt, ‘Typos’ (BFT, 2nd Series, 43), 1939, 113–16, 120–27  
A. v. Harnack, ‘Die Bezeichnung Jesu als “Knecht Gottes” und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche’, *SAB*, 28, 1926, 212–38  
G. Kittel, ‘Jesu Worte über sein Sterben’, *DT*, III, 1936, 166–89  
J. Jeremias, ‘Das Lösegeld für Viele’, *Judaica*, 3, 1948, 249–64  
J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, E. Tr., 1955  
E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus = SAH* 1927–28, Abh. 4, 33–36, 42, 49 n. 4, 69  
E. Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht und Davidsohn* (*Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, 5), 1945  
W. Michaelis, *Herkunft und Bedeutung des Ausdrucks ‘Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi’*, 1945  
O. Procksch, ‘Jesus der Gottesknecht’ in *In piam memoriam Alexander von Bulmerincq* (Abh. der Herder-Gesellschaft zu Riga VI, 3) 1938, 146–65  
J. H. Ropes, ‘The Influence of Second Isaiah on the Epistles’, *JBL* 48, 1929, 37–39  
G. Sass, ‘Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus’, *ZNW*, 40, 1941, 24–33  
K. H. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des N.T.*, 1949, 60–194  
C. C. Torrey, ‘The Influence of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts’, *JBL*, 48, 1929, 24–36  
V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 1937  
V. Taylor, *The Atonement in N.T. Teaching*, 2nd ed., 1945  
G. Wiencke, ‘Paulus über Jesu Tod’, *BFT*, 2nd Series, 42, 1939, 161–64  
I. Zolli, *Il Nazareno*, 1938, 228–33, 331–55

## INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

References to the Targum are included. References are according to the Revised Version unless otherwise stated, even when the reference in the text is to the LXX.

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Genesis</i>			
4.2	9 n. 4	14.31	19, 21 n. 46, 36
15.2	10 n. 10	20.2	10
17.13, 27	10 n. 9	20.5	14
18.3	13 n. 24, 36, 45 n. 156, 46 n. 164	20.10	10 n. 6
18.5	13 n. 24, 36	20.24	27 n. 78
18.17	48 n. 180	21.2, 5, 7, 20	36
18.27	13 n. 25	21.21	9 n. 5
20.14	9 n. 5	21.26 f.	10 n. 6, 36
24	26	21.32	36
24.5, 9, 10	10 n. 10	23.13	27 n. 78
24.12	10	32.13	36
24.14	19 n. 43	32.30	32 n. 98
24.17	10 n. 10	34.14	14
24.27	10	<i>Leviticus</i>	
24.34	10 n. 10	22.11	9 n. 5, 10 n. 9
24.35	9 n. 5	25.39 f.	9 n. 3
24.42, 48	10	25.42	10
24.52	10 n. 10	25.44	36
24.54 ff.	10	25.55	13 n. 23
24.59	10 n. 10	<i>Numbers</i>	
26.24	19 n. 43	11.11	13 n. 25
30.43	9 n. 5	12.7 f.	15, 19, 36
32.5	9 n. 5	14.24	16 n. 29, 20 n. 44, 36
32.10	36	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
45.16	36 n. 111	3.24	13 n. 25
50.17	13 n. 22, 36 n. 111	3.26	32 n. 98
<i>Exodus</i>		4.24	14
4.10	13 n. 25, 36, 48 n. 183	5.6	10
5.16	36	5.9	14
12.44	10 n. 9	5.14	10 n. 9
		6.12	10

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>II Samuel</i>	
6.15	14	8.6 f.	40 n. 127
12.12	10 n. 9	9.2	11 n. 14, 37 n. 113
32.36	36 f., 46 n. 169	9.8	12 n. 18
32.43	36 f.	9.9	11 n. 14
34.5	43 f. 48 n. 183	9.10, 12	37 n. 112
<i>Joshua</i>		10.2 ff.	11 n. 14
1.1	39 n. 115	10.19	12, 37
1.2, 7	20	11.9, 13	11 n. 14
1.13	20, 36	12.18 f.	37
1.15	20, 39 n. 119, 48 n. 183	15.34	11 n. 14, 37
9.8 f.	36	17.4, 7, 25 f.	40 n. 127
9.11	12 n. 16, 36	19.17	37 n. 112
9.23	12, 36	21.22	37
12.6	36	<i>I Kings</i>	
14.7	39 n. 115	4.6	11 n. 14
23.7	27 n. 78	8.53, 56	20
24.19	14	8.59	38 n. 114
24.29	20 n. 44, 36	9.22	9 n. 2
<i>Judges</i>		11.13	20 n. 45, 84 n. 370
2.8	20 n. 44, 36	11.26	11 n. 14
<i>I Samuel</i>		11.32	20 n. 45, 84 n. 370
3.12-14	58	11.34	20, 84 n. 370
7.1	22 n. 57	11.36	20 n. 45, 48 n. 184
8	30 n. 92	14.8	48 n. 184
8.14 f.	11 n. 13	14.18	22
11.5, 10	22 n. 57	15.29	22
15.34	11 n. 14	16.9	11 n. 14
16.15	11 n. 14	18.36	21
18.5	11 n. 12	19.16	27 n. 79
21.7	11 n. 14	20.32	12 n. 16
22.6	37 n. 113	22.19 ff.	22 n. 53
22.7	11 n. 13	<i>II Kings</i>	
22.8	37	8.13	12 n. 18
22.9	11 n. 12	8.19	20 n. 45, 84 n. 370
22.14	37 n. 113	9.7	22 n. 52
25.10	37	9.36	22
30.13	37 n. 112	10.5	12 n. 16
<i>II Samuel</i>		10.10	22
2.12 f., 15, 17	11 n. 12	14.25	22
3.18	20, 84 n. 370	16.7	12 n. 16, 14
7	40 n. 127	17.13, 23	22 n. 52
		17.27	30 n. 92

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>II Kings</i>		<i>Psalms</i>	
18.12	20	2	31 n. 96
18.24	12	2.7	81 and n. 349
19.23	11 n. 14	15	16 n. 30
19.34	20 n. 45, 84 n. 370	18 tit.	39 n. 122
20.6	20 n. 45, 84 n. 370	24	16 n. 30
21.10	22 n. 52	34.22	17
22.12	11, 37	36 tit.	48 n. 184
24.2	22 n. 52	50	16 n. 30
<i>I Chronicles</i>		79.2	17
6.49	13 n. 22	80.8 ff.	79
16.13	19 n. 43	86.16	39 n. 122
17	40 n. 127	89.3	21, 59 n. 249
18.6 f.	40 n. 127	89.19	59 n. 249
28.5	21 n. 46	89.20	21
29.23	21 n. 46	89.39, 50	21 n. 47
<i>II Chronicles</i>		105.6	19 n. 43
1.3	20	105.25	17
13.6	11 n. 14	105.26	20 n. 44
13.18	21 n. 46	109.28	16
24.6	20, 22 n. 55, 40	113.1	16 n. 33, 39 n. 122
24.9	13 n. 22	119.17, 23, 76,	
32.16	21 n. 46	135, 140, 176	16
34.20	11	132.10	84 n. 370
<i>Ezra</i>		134.1	16 n. 33
2.55, 58	12 n. 21	135.1	16 n. 33
5.11	13 n. 22, 39 n. 123, 45	135.12	47 n. 175
9.11	22 n. 52, 39 n. 123	135.14	17
<i>Nehemiah</i>		136.22	18 n. 41, 47 n. 175
1.7, 11	40	143.11 f.	14 n. 26
7.57, 60	12 n. 21	149.6	93 n. 425
9.14	40	<i>Proverbs</i>	
10.49	13 n. 22	12.18	9 n. 4
11.3	12 n. 21	28.19	9 n. 4
<i>Job</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
1.8	23, 39 n. 121	6.2	47 n. 174
2.3	23	6.7	27 n. 80
4.18	21 n. 49, 22, 80	6.10	67 n. 290, 92
7.2	9 n. 2	8.11	62 n. 263
14.13-15	23	9.3	33 n. 104
30.4	74 n. 317	9.6	41
42.7	23	10.15	42
		11.1	41

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
11.2	60	42.2 f.	28 and n. 86, 30 n. 92
11.4	60, 93 n. 425	42.3 f.	26
20.3	22 n. 51, 23 n. 58, 50	42.4	28, 30 n. 92, 41, 60, 80 and n. 346
22.20	23 n. 58, 50	42.5-9	24 n. 63
33.10	42	42.6	27, 29 n. 89, 59 f., 62, 90 n., 403, 93
37.24	11 n. 14	42.7	26, 28 f., 60, 94 n. 428
37.35	23 n. 58, 48 n. 184, 50	42.9	22 n. 50
40 ff.	51 f., 71, 102	42.16	94 n. 428
40.10 f.	33 n. 104	42.19	18, 47 n. 169, 50, 51 nn. 199, 200, 52 and n. 207, 54 and n. 215, 55 and n. 219, 67 n. 291
40.27	29	42.22	29
41.1-5	30 n. 91	42.23	51 n. 199
41.8	47 nn. 176-7, 50, 51 n. 199, 52 and nn. 203 and 207, 56	43.1-10	68 n. 293
41.8 ff.	17 n. 38, 18, 47 nn. 175-6, 54 and n. 213, 67 n. 291	43.8	18, 29
41.9	47 n. 176, 50, 51 n. 199, 52 and nn. 203, 207	43.8-13	30 n. 91
41.21-29	30 n. 91	43.10	30 n. 92, 49 f., 51 n. 199, 56 f., 67 and n. 293, 77
41.22 f., 26 f.	22 n. 50	43.27	19 n. 42
42	66 n. 289, 86	44.1	18, 47 nn. 175-6, 50, 51 n. 199, 54
42.1	24 n. 66, 26, 27 and n. 79, 40, 43, 47 n. 175, 49 f., 51 n. 199, 52 and nn. 203 and 206-7, 57, 59 and n. 249, 60 ff., 67 and n. 293, 80 n. 345, 82	44.1 f.	17 n. 38, 67 n. 291
42.1 ff.	24, 27 and n. 82, 30 n. 92, 41, 53, 54 n. 216, 59 f., 62, 67 n. 292, 71, 75, 77, 80, 81 and n. 350, 88, 90, 93 f., 98	44.2	18, 47 nn. 175-6, 50, 51 n. 199, 54 and n. 213
		44.4-6	30 n. 91
		44.8	30 n. 92
		44.21	13 n. 23, 17 n. 38, 18, 47 nn. 175- 6, 50, 51 n. 199, 54, 67 n. 291
		44.22	18, 29
		44.26	21 n. 49, 26 n. 71,

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
	47 n. 169, 50, 51 n. 199, 52 n. 208, 55 n. 221, 56, 67 n. 291	49.7	24 and n. 63, 30 f., 34, 41, 59
45.4	17 n. 38, 18, 47 n. 176, 50, 51 n. 199, 54, 67 n. 291	49.8	27, 29 n. 89, 71 n. 305
45.9 f.	30	49.8 ff.	28, 56
45.20	30 n. 91	49.8-13	24 n. 63, 41
45.23 f.	29 n. 89	49.9	26, 29
48.20	17 n. 35, 18, 46 n. 166, 47 nn. 175-6, 50, 51 n. 200, 52 n. 208, 54, 67 n. 291	50.4	27
49.1	27 and n. 78, 56 n. 228, 59	50.4 ff.	25, 27, 56 n. 226
49.1 f.	60, 77	50.4-9	24, 30, 41, 54 n. 216, 55
49.1-6	24, 41	50.5	32 n. 100
49.2	26 f., 28 n. 86, 59 and n. 252, 93 n. 425	50.7 ff.	32
49.3	24 f., 27, 41, 47 nn., 175-6, 50, 51 n. 200, 54 and n. 213, 55, 67 n. 291	50.10	46 n. 167, 50, 51 n. 199, 54 ff., 67 n. 291
49.4	32	51.8	33 n. 103
49.5	24, 27, 50, 51 n. 200, 55 f.	52.13	27, 41 f., 42 n. 136, 50, 51 n. 199, 52 nn., 203 and 207, 53, 57, 60, 67 nn. 290 and 293, 68, 75 n. 328, 86 n. 380, 97 and n. 446
49.5 f.	13 n. 23, 28 f., 54 and n. 214, 67 n. 291	52.13 ff.	24, 32 n. 99, 33, 49, 55 n. 217, 60 and n. 254, 71, 72 n. 308, 77 and n. 337, 98
49.6	27, 29 n. 89, 50, 51 n. 199, 52 and nn. 203 and 207, 57, 59, 62, 71 n. 305, 88 n. 390, 90 n. 403, 93, 98	52.13-53.12	24 and nn. 65, and 67, 30 f., 33, 41, 44, 53, 62, 66 n. 289, 67 f., 71 f., 93 f., 95 n. 434
49.6 f.	60, 77	52.14	41, 42 nn. 134-5, 60 f., 68, 97 n. 446
		52.14 f.	34, 41
		52.15	31, 41, 53, 55, 59 ff., 68, 78 n. 340, 88, 93 f., 99

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
	n. 455		n. 446
53	31, 33, 42, 50, 53, 54 and n. 216, 57 f., 59 n. 251, 62, 64, 66 and n. 289, 67 n. 290, 71 and n. 304, 72, 73 and n. 313, 74, 75 and n. 324, 76 and n. 329, 77 n. 338, 86, 88, 89 and nn. 396, 398 and 400, 90, 91 and n. 412, 93 f., 96, 97 and n. 444, 98 and n. 448, 99 and n. 452, 100 n. 460, 102, 104	53.4-6	95 n. 431
53.1	68, 88, 92, 94	53.5	57 n. 241, 61 f., 67 n. 290, 69, 72 and n. 311, 74, 89 n. 397, 90 n. 409, 95 n. 434, 96 n. 438
53.1 ff.	41 f.	53.6	32, 53, 69, 72 n. 311, 86 n. 380, 89, 91 f.
53.1-10a	33	53.7	32, 67 n. 290, 69, 73, 97 n. 446, 99 and nn. 453 and 458
53.1-11a	24, 32 n. 99	53.7 f.	53, 56, 88, 91, 94
53.1-12	68, 77	53.8	42 n. 138, 69, 98
53.2	41 and nn. 129, 132, 61, 68, 73 n. 313, 75, 86 n. 380	53.8-10	31
53.2-4	53	53.9	42 n. 140, 62, 65 and n. 285, 67 n. 290, 70, 91, 99
53.3	53, 61, 67 n. 290, 68, 69 n. 296, 70 n. 302, 73 n. 313, 90, 98, 102	53.10	31 n. 98, 32, 33 n. 105, 55, 67 n. 290, 70, 91 f., 95 nn. 431 and 434, 96 and n. 442, 98, 99 and n. 455
53.4	31 n. 93, 62 and n. 267, 63 and n. 273, 64 and nn. 274-5, 66 n. 289, 67 n. 290, 69, 74, 88, 90, 93 n. 424, 94, 95 n. 434, 97	53.10-12	53, 89 n. 401
		53.11	27, 42 n. 139, 50, 51 n. 200, 53, 55, 57, 59 n. 250, 60, 67 n. 291, 70, 75 n. 324, 86 n. 380, 89 n. 399, 91, 95 and n. 432, 98 f.
		53.11b-12	24, 32 n. 99
		53.12	33, 53, 56 and n. 234, 57, 64, 65 and nn. 283-4, 66, 70 and

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i>	
n. 302, 75, 76		30.10	17 n. 35, 18 n. 41, 43, 45 n. 156, 47 nn. 175-6
n. 329, 83, 88, 89		33.15	59 n. 250
n. 397, 90 and		33.21 f., 26	21
nn. 404 and 409,		35.14	22 n. 52
91 ff., 95 and		35.15	40, 46 n. 167
n. 434, 96 nn. 438		43.10	21
and 440, 97 and		44.4	22 n. 52, 40, 46 n. 167
nn. 445-6, 98		45.4 f.	31 n. 97
f., 103		46.27 f.	18 n. 41, 40, 47 n. 175
54.17	39		
56.6	13 n. 23, 17, 40 n. 124		
61.1	27 n. 79		
63.17	40 n. 124		
65.8 f.	17		
65.9	40 n. 124		
13 ff.	17		
65.14	40 n. 124, 47 n. 172		
66.24	65 n. 286		
<i>Jeremiah</i>			
1.5	29 n. 88		
1.9	27 n. 80		
1.10	29 n. 88		
7.25	22 n. 52, 40		
9.4	19 n. 42		
11.19	32		
12.1-6	29 n. 87		
12.3	32 n. 101		
12.7 ff.	31 n. 97		
15.16	27 n. 77		
15.19	32 n. 100		
20.14 ff.	31 n. 97		
23.5	59 n. 250		
23.29	28 n. 86		
25.4	22 n. 52, 40		
25.9	21		
26.5	22 n. 52, 40, 46 n. 167		
27-29	21		
27.6	21		
29.19	22 n. 52		
		<i>Hosea</i>	
		12.3 ff.	19 n. 42
		<i>Amos</i>	
		3.7	22 n. 52, 23 n. 58

Bible Ref.	Page	Bible Ref.	Page
<i>Micah</i>		<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
4.1	51 n. 202	2.13	43 and n. 145, 44, 53
<i>Nahum</i>		2.16, 18	44
1.2	14	2.19 f.	53
<i>Haggai</i>		4.18	53
2.23	21, 49 n. 195	4.20 ff.	53, 60 n. 254
<i>Zechariah</i>		5.1 ff.	44, 77 n. 337
1.6	22 n. 52	5.3 f.	53
3.8	49	5.5	44 n. 151, 53
9.9	59 n. 250	5.6 f., 15 f.	53
12.10 ff.	74 n. 318	9.4	43 and n. 145
12.12	74	9.5	46 n. 164
13.5	9 n. 4	9.7	43 n. 145
<i>Malachi</i>		10.16	48 n. 183
4.4 f.	20	12.7	43
4.5 f.	103	12.19 ff.	43 n. 145
<i>I Esdras</i>		19.6	43
4.59	45 n. 160, 46 n. 164	<i>Ecclesiasticus</i>	
6.13	39 n. 123, 43, 45, 46 n. 166	11.13	55
6.27	43, 45, 49 n. 191	36.1	45 n. 160
8.82	39 n. 123, 43 f., 46 n. 167	36.17	45 n. 160, 46 n. 164, 47 n. 169
<i>II Esdras (IV Ezra)</i>		48.10	57
1.32	80	<i>Baruch</i>	
2.1, 18	80	1.20	43 ff., 48 n. 183
3.11	48 n. 185	2.20 24	43 ff., 46 n. 167
3.23	48 n. 184	2.28	43 ff., 48 n. 183
5.45, 56	46 n. 164	3.36	43, 44 n. 149, 45, 47 n. 177
7.28 f.	45 n. 163, 49	<i>I Maccabees</i>	
7.75, 102	46 n. 164	4.30	48 n. 184
8.2, 24	46 n. 164	<i>II Maccabees</i>	
10.37	46 n. 164	7.6	46 n. 169
12.8	46 n. 164	7.33	43 n. 148, 46 n. 169
12.31 f.	99 n. 457	7.34	43, 46 n. 166
13.1-13	99 n. 457	7.37f.	102 n. 476
13.14	46 n. 164	8.29	46 nn. 164, 166 and 169
13.25-32	99 n. 457	<i>Matthew</i>	
13.32, 37, 52	45 n. 163, 49 and n. 196	1.22	93 n. 424
14.9	45 n. 163, 49 and n. 196, 99 n. 457	3.17	27 n. 81, 81
14.31	48 n. 183		

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Matthew</i>			
5.3 f.	102	4.12	67 n. 290
5.12	101 n. 467	4.13, 40 f.	77 n. 331
8.17	88, 90 and n. 408, 93 n. 424, 94	6.16	101
11.5	102	6.52	77 n. 331
12.18	79 f., 81 and n. 352, 82, 83 n. 360, 86, 95 n. 429	7.18	77 n. 331
12.18-20	80, 90 n. 408, 94	8.16-21	77 n. 331
12.18-21	88, 90	8.31	90 nn. 405-6, 100 n. 459, 103
12.21	80, 93	8.32	77 n. 331
17.5	27 n. 81, 82	8.33	103
17.12, 22	90 n. 405	9.7	27 n. 81, 80 ff., 86, 90 and nn. 402 and 408, 95
20.19	100 n. 459	9.11	103
20.28	89, 95 and n. 435, 96 and n. 442, 98	9.12	90 and nn. 405-6 and 408, 98, 101 ff.
21.35 f.	101 n. 469	9.31	96 n. 437, 100 n. 459, 102
22.6	101 n. 469	9.32	76 n. 331
23.30-32	101 n. 469	10.32-40	101
23.33	93 n. 424	10.33	96 n. 437
23.34-6	101	10.33 f.	100 n. 459
23.37	100 n. 465, 101 and n. 469	10.38	77 n. 331
24.26	59 n. 252	10.39	102 n. 472
24.30	74 n. 318	10.42-5	102 n. 474
25.41, 46	65 n. 286	10.45	89, 90 n. 408, 92, 95 and n. 435, 96 and nn. 436 and 442, 98, 102, 104 and n. 487
26.2	96 n. 437	11.17	102
26.28	95 n. 435, 96 n. 436	14.3-9	103 and n. 480
26.54	90 n. 405, 93 and n. 424	14.8	99, 101 ff.
26.63	99	14.21	90 n. 405
26.64	99 n. 454	14.22-5	104 n. 484
27.12, 14	99	14.24	89, 90 n. 408, 95 and n. 435, 96 and n. 436, 99,
27.46	81 n. 349		102, 104
<i>Mark</i>			
1.10	81	14.41	96 n. 437
1.11	27 n. 81, 80 ff., 86, 90 and nn. 402 and 408, 95	14.49	90 n. 405
2.7	100		
2.20	98, 99 and n. 457		
2.23-3.7a	100 and nn. 463-4		

<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Bible Ref.</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Mark</i>		<i>Luke</i>	
14.61	99	23.34	99 and n. 455, 102
14.62	99 n. 454	23.35	61
15.5	99	24.7	90 n. 405, 96 n. 437
15.34	81 n. 349	24.21	102 n. 472
15.45	103 n. 480	24.25-7, 32, 44-6	90 n. 405
<i>Luke</i>		<i>John</i>	
1.54	45, 47 n. 177, 54 n. 213, 79 and n. 341	1.29	82 f., 86, 92, 96 and n. 440
1.69	45, 48 n. 184, 79 and n. 341, 85	1.34	61 and n. 261, 81 n. 350, 82, 92, 95
2.29-32	98	1.36	82, 92
2.32	90 and n. 403, 97	3.14	92, 96 n. 441
3.22	27 n. 81, 61 and n. 349	5.10	100 n. 463
4.18 ff.	102	6.51	95 n. 435
4.29	100 n. 465	7.27	59 n. 252
9.31	90 n. 405	7.39	96 n. 441
9.35	27 n. 81, 61 n. 260, 82, 95 and n. 429	8.28	96 n. 441
9.44	90 n. 405, 102	8.59	100 n. 465
11.21 f.	98 n. 450	10.11, 15	92, 95 n. 435, 96, 99, 102
11.22	100 n. 460	10.17 f.	92, 96, 99, 102
12.50	102	10.31, 33	100 n. 461
13.31	101	10.31-6	100 n. 465
13.32	103 n. 478	11.8	100 n. 465
13.32 f.	102	11.51 f.	95 n. 435
13.33	90 n. 405, 101 and n. 469	12.16, 23, 32	96 n. 441
14.25-33	101	12.34	92, 96 n. 441
17.25	90 n. 405, 102, 103 n. 478	12.37 f.	92 n. 423
18.31	90 n. 405	12.38	88, 92 and n. 421, 94
22.19	96 n. 439	12.40	92
22.19 f.	95 n. 435, 104 n. 483	15.13	95 n. 435
22.22	90 n. 405	16.32	92
22.24-7	102 n. 474	17.1, 5	96 n. 441
22.36-8	103	17.19	95 n. 435
22.37	66, 88, 90 and nn. 404 and 408, 99, 102 f.	18.14	95 n. 435
23.9	99	19.9	99
		19.37	74 n. 318
		19.38 ff.	103 n. 480
		<i>Acts</i>	
		1.6	102 n. 472

Bible Ref.	Page	Bible Ref.	Page
<i>Acts</i>		<i>Acts</i>	
2.23	91 n. 414	10.43	91 n. 414
2.33	96 n. 441	13.27, 29	91 n. 414
3	91	13.47	88 n. 390
3.13	76 and n. 341, 80, 83 n. 356, 85 and n. 379, 86 and n. 380, 87 nn. 385-6, 96 n. 441	17.2 f.	91 n. 414
3.13 f.	91 n. 412	17.25	38 n. 117
3.14	91	22.13 f.	91
3.18	91 n. 414	26.18	88 n. 390, 94 n. 428
3.26	79 and n. 341, 80, 83 n. 356, 85 and n. 379, 86 and n. 380, 87 nn. 385-6	26.22 f.	91 n. 414
4	91	<i>Romans</i>	
4.25	48 n. 184, 79 and n. 341, 84, 85 and n. 379, 87 n. 385	3.25	89 n. 399, 95 n. 435
4.27	79 and n. 341, 80, 83 n. 356, 84, 85 and n. 379, 86 and n. 380, 87 nn. 385-6	4.25	66, 89 and n. 397, 96 nn. 437-9, 97
4.28	91 n. 414	5.6, 8	95 n. 435
4.30	79 and n. 341, 80, 83 n. 356, 84, 85 and n. 379 86 and n. 380, 87 nn. 385-6	5.19	89 n. 399
5.31	96 n. 441	8.3	95 n. 435, 96 n. 442
7.51 f.	101 n. 469	8.32	89, 95 n. 435, 96 n. 439
7.52	91 and n. 414	8.34	65, 89, 95
8.5-40	91	10.16	92, 94
8.12 ff.	91 and n. 411	11.3	101, n. 469
8.32 f.	88, 91, 94	14.15	95 n. 435
8.34	24 n. 67, 56	15.21	88 f. 93 f.
8.36, 38 f.	91 and n. 411	<i>I Corinthians</i>	
9.17	91	1.13	95 n. 435
		1.23	77 n. 331
		5.7	95 n. 435
		8.11	95 n. 435
		11.23	96 nn. 437-8
		11.23-5	89
		11.24	95 n. 435, 104 n. 484
		15.3	90, 94, 95 and nn. 433 and 435
		15.3-5	88
		<i>II Corinthians</i>	
		5.14 f.	95 n. 435
		5.21	95 n. 435, 96 n. 441
		<i>Galatians</i>	
		1.4	95 n. 435, 96 and n. 439
		2.20	95 n. 435, 96 and n. 439

Bible Ref.	Page	Bible Ref.	Page
<i>Galatians</i>		<i>I Peter</i>	
3.13	77 n. 331, 95 n. 435	1.11	92
<i>Ephesians</i>		2.21	95 n. 435
1.6	95 n. 429	2.21-5	91, 98
5.2, 25	95 n. 435, 96 and n. 439	2.22	96
<i>Philippians</i>		2.22-5	97
2.5-11	97 and nn. 444-6, 98	2.24	96 and n. 440
2.6-11	86, 89 and n. 398	3.18	91, 95 n. 435
<i>I Thessalonians</i>		4.1	95 n. 435
2.15	101 n. 469	<i>II Peter</i>	
5.10	95 n. 435	1.17	95 n. 429
<i>I Timothy</i>		<i>I John</i>	
2.6	89, 95 n. 435, 96 and nn. 436, 439 and 442	1.7	74 n. 318
<i>Titus</i>		2.1	92, 95
2.14	95 n. 435, 96 and n. 439	2.1 f.	65
<i>Hebrews</i>		2.2	92, 95 n. 435
2.9	95 n. 435	2.29	92
2.10	43 n. 147	3.5	92, 96 and n. 440
7.14	58	3.7	92
7.25	65, 95	3.16	95 n. 435
9.28	93, 96	4.10	92, 95 n. 435
10.12, 26	95 n. 435	<i>Revelation</i>	
11.35-8	101 n. 469	Book of	83, 92
<i>James</i>		1.16	93 n. 425
5.10	101 n. 469	11.7	101 n. 469
		11.18	46 n. 167
		12.5	59 n. 252
		15.3	48 n. 183
		16.6	101 n. 469
		18.24	101, n. 469
		19.15	93 n. 425

THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

13699